

УДК 37.016:81'271.1
ББК Ш12/18-9-6

**Р. Шлейфер, М. А. Таунсенд,
К. В. Тсиопос Уилз,
О. Аксакалова, Д. Немец-
Игнашева, Т. Венедиктова**
*Норман, Колумбия, Колумбус,
Нью-Йорк, Нортфилд, США;
Москва, Россия*

**R. Schleifer, M. A. Townsend,
Tsiopos Wills, K.V.,
O. Aksakalova, D. Nemes
Ignashev, T. Venediktova**
*Norman, Columbia, Columbus,
New York, Northfield, U.S.;
Moscow, Russia*

ПОД СТРОГИМ ВЗГЛЯДОМ ЛОМОНОСОВА: УЧЕБНАЯ СЕССИЯ ПО РАЗВИТИЮ АКАДЕМИЧЕСКОГО ПИСЬМА В РОССИИ

АННОТАЦИЯ. Наличие культурных различий и барьеров существенно осложняет процесс преподавания академического письма, как для преподавателей, так и для учащихся. Задача статьи – осмыслить опыт совместного проведения авторами учебной сессии по академическому письму в Москве (Россия), рассмотрев ее как возможную модель для дальнейших кросс-культурных форумов для обмена опытом по преподаванию академического письма. Анализируются планирование, процесс проведения и результаты XVI Международной фулбрайтовской школы по академическому письму, проведенной в МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова в 2013 году, а также данные опросов, осуществленных по ходу школы. Преподаватели (гуманитарии и естественники) собрались для обсуждения вопросов, связанных с преподаванием письма в международном контексте. Рассматривались принятые в США стратегии обучения письму в рамках и вне рамок учебных дисциплин (соответственно, WID и WAC) с точки зрения эффективности и уместности их использования. Результаты могут представлять интерес для преподавателей, администраторов, исследователей, аспирантов, ведущих программы академического письма в международной среде. В статье дается мета-анализ учебной сессии и результаты качественного самообследования ее участников, обсуждаются методы преподавания, применимые в разноязыкой аудитории, описываются возможные формы поддержки международной публикационной активности преподавателей и аспирантов (пишущих на английском и других языках), предлагаются рекомендации по дальнейшей организации международных учебных семинаров по академическому письму.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: Программы академического письма в США и в России, WAC, WID, педагогика письма

Сведения об авторах: Рональд Шлейфер, доктор философии, профессор кафедры английской литературы, адъюнкт-профессор медицины, университет Оклахомы; адрес: г. Норман, штат Оклахома, 73019, США, e-mail : schleifer@ou.edu

Марта А. Таунсенд, доктор философии, Почетный профессор кафедры английской литературы, университет Миссури; адрес: г. Колумбия, штат Миссури, 65211-1500, США, e-mail : TownsendM@missouri.edu

Кэтрин В. Тсиопос Уилз, доктор философии, доцент кафедры английской литературы, директор программы письма, университет Индианы; адрес: г. Колумбус, Центральная авеню, 4601, США, e-mail : kwills@iupuc.edu

Ольга Аксакалова, доктор философии, доцент кафедры английской литературы, городской университет Нью-Йорка, ЛаГуардия Комм'юнити Колледж; адрес: Лонг Айлденд Сити, Томсон авеню, 31-10, штата Нью-Йорк, 11101, США, e-mail : oaksakalova@lagcc.cuny.edu

Диана Немец-Игнашева, доктор философии, профессор кафедры немецкой и русской филологии, Карлтон Колледж; адрес: г. Нортфилд, ул. Норт-Колледж, 100, штат Миннесота, 55057, США; профессор кафедры теории дискурса и коммуникации филологического факультета МГУ им. М.в. Ломоносова; адрес: МГУ, 1-ый корпус гуманитарных факультетов, к. 939, Ленинские горы, ГСП-1, Москва, 119991, Россия, e-mail: dignashe@carleton.edu

Татьяна Венедиктова, доктор филологических наук, профессор, зав. кафедрой теории дискурса и коммуникации филологического факультета МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова; адрес: МГУ, 1-ый корпус гуманитарных факультетов, к. 939, Ленинские горы, ГСП-1, Москва, 119991, Россия, e-mail : tvenediktova@mail.ru

UNDER LOMONOSOV'S WATCHFUL GAZE: A CASE STUDY OF AN EARLY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT WRITING WORKSHOP IN RUSSIA

ABSTRACT. The teaching of academic writing to global audiences and across cultures poses significant challenges to teachers and learners alike. The purpose of this article is to document a workshop that the co-authors collaborated in delivering in Moscow, Russia, in the hope that we can inspire others to undertake similar exchanges. This inventory of the fruits of the workshop provides insights from empirical findings regarding the teaching practices and perceptions among Russian and American faculty who teach writing. Our case study discusses the planning, delivery, and outcomes of the workshop and survey results that were gathered for the 16th Annual Moscow State University Fulbright Summer School weeklong workshop on academic writing (2013). Faculty across diverse disciplines in Philology, Arts, and Sciences addressed issues in the teaching of writing in higher education for global audiences. Data show that WAC, WID, and TESOL strategies are implicit and explicit frames of teaching writing across cultures and languages. Findings are relevant to teachers, administrators, researchers, and graduate students of higher education writing across disciplines (e.g. STEM, TESOL) who teach in international contexts. Features of the article include qualitative survey results, discussion of appropriate teaching strategies across languages, faculty reflections, meta-analysis of the workshop, the need to support faculty and graduate students to publish internationally in a variety of languages, not just English, and a summary of outcomes. We conclude with recommendations for educational leaders who may convene workshops and seminars about teaching writing across cultures.

KEYWORDS: Writing Programs, American Writing Programs, Russian Federation Writing Programs, WAC, WID, writing pedagogy.

About the authors:

Ronald Schleifer, PhD, George Lynn Cross Research Professor, Department of English, Adjunct Professor in Medicine, University of Oklahoma Norman, OK 73019, USA.

Martha A. Townsend, PhD, Professor Emerita, Department of English, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211-1500, USA.

Katherine V. Tsiopos Wills, PhD, Associate Professor, Director English Program, English Department, Indiana University-Purdue University Columbus, Columbus, 4601 Central Ave, USA.

Olga Aksakalova, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of English, City University of New York, LaGuardia Community College, 31-10 Thomson Avenue, Long Island City, NY 11101, USA.

Diane Nemeč Ignashev, PhD, Class of 1941 Professor of Russian and Liberal Arts, Department of German and Russian, Carleton College, 100 North College St., Northfield, MN 55057, USA; Department of Discourse and Communication Studies, Faculty of Philology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, 1st Humanities Bldg., 939, Leninskie gory, GSP-1, Moscow 119991, Russia.

Tatiana Venediktova, Doctor of Philology, Professor and Chair, Department of Discourse and Communication Studies, Faculty of Philology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, 1st Humanities Bldg., 939, Leninskie gory, GSP-1, Moscow 119991, Russia.

This essay charts the planning, delivery, and outcomes of "Academic Writing: Perspectives from Russia and the U.S.," the 16th annual Fulbright Summer School in the Humanities, hosted by the Faculty of Philology and the Faculty of Journalism of Moscow State University. Of the sixteen Fulbright summer schools this was the first to address academic writing specifically. In earlier seminars academic writing, brainstorming, and group collaborative work had all been addressed, but as components of other topics. Similarly, in 2012 the Department of Discourse and Communication Studies had initiated its own courses in academic writing. Because it was the first of its kind in this well-established Summer School series sponsored by the Fulbright Foundation and the Moscow State University's

Department of Communication Studies, chaired by Tatiana Venediktova, and because the groundwork for discussion had already been laid, we guest faculty felt a fine invitation to share our knowledge of composition theory and practice as taught in the U.S. We U.S. guest facilitators understood that our presentations should demonstrate scholarly acumen and cultural sensitivity. We were also eager to learn from our Russian counterparts about their methodologies and pedagogies in the teaching of writing. We wanted to use this new knowledge to improve our teaching in both local and international contexts.

In this case study we offer our recollections to document this event, to present one model for such an exchange, and to encourage others to engage in

similar intercultural exchanges even during challenging geopolitical times. We describe how the Summer School came together, the week's curriculum, the presentations made by guest faculty from the U.S. and from Russia, and what has happened since, followed by our reflections on the event. We offer advice to others who may be considering mounting or participating in inter- and cross-cultural writing workshops. And we conclude by endorsing the benefits of collaborations such as ours, with hope that our experience can serve as a starting point for others and that insights can be widely shared.

Conceiving, planning, and early outcomes of the seminar

Following a call for participation to which over one hundred applicants responded, about one-third were invited to attend. Most had recent experience teaching academic writing at the assistant or associate professor level; several were still pursuing graduate degrees. Many were teachers of English as a Foreign Language or of Technical Communication. Thirty-four universities from cities within Russia were represented: Astrakhan, Barnaul, Bryansk, Izhevsk, Magnitogorsk, Nizhni Novgorod, Pyatigorsk, Saint Petersburg, Saransk, Tomsk, Vladivostok, Voronezh, and Vyatka. Institutions from Moscow proper included Moscow University, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow State Institute of International Relationships (MGIMO), Financial Academy, New Economic School, and the Higher School of Economics.

As organizers of the "Academic Writing: Perspectives from Russia and the U.S." Fulbright Summer School, Tania, Diane, and Olga were already attuned to Russian higher education's imperative for the country's scholars to increase publication of their research in international journals, an imperative they conveyed to the American facilitators as an essential focus for the Summer School. Other objectives that impelled the event are subsumed in these questions: How can we improve the teaching of academic writing in a modern university? What practices facilitate better graduate and undergraduate research writing? How can educational technology serve academic writing? And what methods exist for responding to student work? Besides these general

questions, the organizers were keen to develop questions and concerns that would facilitate the mutual enrichment of Russian and American pedagogical practices.

- What features of writing pedagogy as practiced in the United States and Russia can be adopted/adapted in the partner country, and how can these adaptations be achieved with due account of the differences between cultural backgrounds and educational traditions?

The concepts of writing across the curriculum (WAC) and writing in the disciplines (WID) seemed the most adaptive by the participants for their classes, primarily because they were already teaching academic writing in a similar manner.

- How can Summer School participants collaborate to compile resources on writing pedagogy, drawing on existing materials on WAC, rhetoric, and composition, to be published in Russian, for use at the university level?

Some of the summer school participants and facilitators have collaborated by writing this article, visiting the U.S., and adding texts in Russian to resources on the Summer School website 2013.

- How can broad and deep philological and pedagogical knowledge in Russia contribute to international writing research and American writing studies?

The Fulbright Summer School and resultant articles serve as models for conducting international writing research projects, thus encouraging researchers to observe pedagogical practices *in situ* in other countries.

Taking a long view of how the Fulbright Summer School might meet its objectives, the Moscow organizers outlined the following goals, which are accompanied here by the U.S. team's initial perceptions of what occurred:

- To ascertain historical trends and modern approaches in writing pedagogy. Our qualitative data from the surveys show that writing practices of English in Russian universities represented at the Fulbright Summer School utilize strategies and assessment from teaching English as foreign or second language pedagogies. Russian language and literature studies in Russian schools are taught using philological pedagogies.

- To conceptualize the process of writing as an instrument for facilitating critical inquiry. Both Russian and American participants clearly expressed the need to facilitate critical thinking in all students at all levels.

- To develop effective strategies for teaching writing across the curriculum. Both Russian and American participants expressed the need for more writing that is authentic and situated in disciplinary genres.

- To design and implement a tutoring program in writing, e.g., a writing center, to be utilized by students, staff, and faculty. Some participants wanted to see more academic writing centers and faculty collaboration on teaching and professional publishing.

- To teach writing to a range of academic audiences: undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, faculty, and staff; EFL/ESL populations. All agreed that teaching writing to a range of academic audiences was an important area of growth.

- To develop methods for the teaching of writing in the Russian academic environment. Owing to the specialized nature of higher education in the Russian Federation, the idea of a general first-year composition class was not as strongly embraced by Russian participants as was teaching writing in specific disciplinary contexts.

- To support faculty and graduate students in their efforts to publish internationally.

All agreed on the need to support faculty and graduate students to publish internationally in a variety of languages, not just English; likewise, all agreed that responding to and grading student writing is a labor-intensive task for which there does not seem to be enough hours in the work week.

- To utilize technology in the composition classroom. The use of technology appealed to participants but many noted that focusing on skills of writing argumentation, synthesis, analysis, revision, and correctness take up most of the teaching time. Participants have included and want to continue include formats such as blogs, online projects, and collaborative writing.

Having broadly conceived the Summer School's focus and goals, our Russian hosts secured facilitators from the United States. On behalf of the

Russian planning team, Olga inquired through WPA-L (the U.S.-based Writing Program Administrators Listserv) who might be qualified to collaborate with Ron in co-facilitating the week. Kathy and Marty were identified, interviewed via Skype by the Russian organizers, and subsequently invited to come to Moscow as part of the three-person U.S. team.

Once the U.S. team was in place, Ron, Marty, and Kathy met; conferred on Skype; and exchanged emails to prepare for their respective assignments. Diane created a Dropbox® for everyone's work documents, so these could be accessible to all. Diane also circulated a pre-event survey for participants who answered the survey questions anonymously, and a compilation of their responses was given to the U.S. team after arriving in Moscow.

In addition to responding to this survey, participants were invited to submit a scholarly article or article-in-progress for Ron to use as a model for developing peer reviews of one another's scholarship and to spur discussion about revising the work to enhance possibility of publication. He received numerous manuscripts, several of which became the focus of close but friendly scrutiny during the week. By the week's end, he had personally responded to all of the manuscripts-in-progress with his expert editor's point of view.

Over beers in Moscow pubs, while walking along shops on cobbled streets, and during dinners, we endeavored to find a consensus about common writing goals that would benefit all our students. We commiserated about the state of student writing in our respective teaching environments. We wanted to help each other help our students. We were eager to contribute new knowledge in writing research: our meeting in Moscow was our start.

Fostering the conversation / advancing cross-cultural perspectives

Early on, the U.S. team was determined to avoid a "talking heads" approach, hoping the Summer School could be discussion based, interactive, and hands on, not least to demonstrate the pedagogical philosophy we enact in our classrooms at home. To the degree that short lectures were necessary, we followed up with extended question and answer sessions, brainstorming, and, of course, in-class informal writing. All participants, Russian and American,

were cognizant of the importance of avoiding even the appearance of hegemony of any one language (Horner *et al.*, 2011; Berry *et al.*, 2012; Canagarajah, 2007). Mindful of Toby Fulwiler's classic "Showing, Not Telling at a Writing Workshop" (1981), as well as more recent research on active learning (Bean, 2011; Dartmouth, 2015), we aimed to engage with our Russian colleagues in open dialogue, to make the week as pragmatically focused and "user friendly" as possible. As a three-person team, we modeled the diverse pedagogies used in U.S. classrooms, replicating our respective active-learning classroom practices as closely as possible. Ron, for instance, pursued the seminar structure of his writing workshops, in which each participant brought his or her expertise to the group as we focused on particular scholarly projects of participants who, necessarily, shared their skills and knowledge with all of us. Marty employed short writing assignments that facilitated the blending of many voices in our discussions. Kathy presented an interactive PowerPoint that created a focused framework in which the similarities and differences between American and Russian strategies revealed themselves.

The Moscow organizers requested that Kathy's portions of the week-long workshop focus on that uniquely American site of instruction called the first-year composition course. What is this anomaly? How does it contrast with what is practiced in Russian higher education? In the first of Kathy's three workshops, she provided a brief chronological and conceptual history of first year composition from colonial education to Wardle and Downs' "Writing about Writing" studies, along with the influence of digital technologies. Kathy's second workshop modeled a first-year composition class held in a computer classroom, a fairly common model in the United States. In her third session, she circulated authentic student essays to participants to practice and examine how individual student essays are typically assessed in the U.S. These three workshops attempted to work towards what the U.S. and Russian faculty share, what they do differently, and how teaching can change to meet students' writing needs.

Interspersed with Kathy's three presentations on first-year composition,

Marty offered three workshops on writing instruction in U.S. higher education that occurs beyond the traditional first-year composition course: (1) WAC, WID, and capstone courses; (2) principles of assignment design; and (3) guidelines for responding to and grading student writing. Although it was challenging to represent the range of courses that are taught in U.S. colleges and universities, Russian participants were exposed to a wide array of course types and the methodologies for teaching them. In the course of these discussions the U.S. facilitators also learned a good deal about Russian courses and methodologies. We were particularly struck by the urgent importance—across disciplines and across all stages in undergraduate education—that Russian students and faculty attributed to skills in communication and critical thinking.

Among Marty's examples, the one that generated the most curiosity was her own capstone course for soon-to-graduate English majors, titled *Democracy and the Liberal Arts*. Participants seemed intrigued that students in the same class could write research papers on topics as disparate as the National Rifle Association's powerful gun control lobby; gay rights; consolidation of U.S. national news coverage by just a few media outlets; and the history of the State of Missouri's annual governors' State of the State addresses—especially when the instructor herself lacks disciplinary background in any of these topics. Chief among Marty's goals for all three of her workshops was to convey the idea that language teachers do not bear sole responsibility for student success in academic writing. On the last day, Marty pleaded for a bit of extra, unscheduled time to encourage teachers and students to *have fun* with their writing. Using Art Young's "Poetry Across the Curriculum" concept, she noted that students in classes ranging from biology and business to chemistry and statistics write poems not to produce literary works of art but to creatively reinforce connections to the disciplines in which they are studying.

Interspersed with Kathy's and Marty's sessions, Ron modeled critical reading and textual analysis for conference participants, both faculty and graduate students, who had submitted their texts prior to the conference. His

workshop sessions modeled face-to-face editing decisions as part of process of the publishing scholarly writing. Ron lectured about "Peer-reviewing: The Rules of the Game" and then read participant texts in a type of read-aloud discourse analysis, as an editor might evaluate a journal article submission, or a professor might evaluate a graduate student's draft.

Ron's workshop presented a particular model regarding how to read the texts. Displaying meta-analytical audience awareness, he asked participants, "I'm going too slowly, aren't I?" Ron presented practical details from his years as a scholarly editor about what makes a thesis effective, as well as the logistics of publishing journal articles and book chapters. His session examined, among others, a seminar paper by Olessya Kirtchik, a co-editor of *Laboratorium: Russian Review of Social Research*. Olessya's paper discussed the challenges of publishing a bilingual sociological journal with international-grade research in Russia. Ron spoke for the all the participants as he noted:

In engaging contemporary Russian scholarship in the humanities and social sciences, I have discovered that there is much that Russian teachers and scholars can learn from our American experience while at the same time there is much we can learn from the sense of widening scholarship and pedagogy that is taking place in Russia today. Writing cross-culturally enriches the work and the horizons of what is possible for both Russians and Americans ([Moscow State University Summer School online](#)).

The sense of give-and-take learning that these remarks note grows out of the collaborative learning structure that Ron facilitates in his seminars, in which master and learner constantly shift. He sets forth a rhetorical and sociological study of such scholarly collaboration in his book, *Analogical Thinking: Post-Enlightenment Understanding in Language, Collaboration, and Interpretation* (2000), particularly the chapter entitled "Practiced Apprenticeship and Successive Renewals: Disciplinarity and Collaboration in the Sciences and Humanities." The "successive renewals," which this chapter examines, is practically accomplished in the classroom with activities of *writing revision* such as those we shared in the

Fulbright Summer School.

Cross cultural dialogue through survey responses

As we noted earlier, the framework for the Summer School was built upon the answers to a pre-course survey. These practical descriptions of people working towards *building* writing into the formal structures of higher education allows us a clearer understanding of the ongoing Russian experience of what we, in the United States, developed without explicit models of success and failure of systematic attention to writing. The Fulbright Summer School, as we have already suggested, offered an array of explicit models of success pedagogical strategies and programs that could be built upon, such as Writing Across the Curriculum, collaborative writing, and the resource of Russian *care* for philology that could usefully inform programs in other countries. The goals the Moscow organizers set forth and described earlier—e.g., the modern approaches undertaken in the Summer School, the strategies for developing critical thinking, the usefulness of writing centers—all provoked the creative engagement of our work together.

This was clear in the sharing of pedagogical strategies throughout the Summer School. Russian participants reported that they assign a wide variety of writing, speaking, and computer-mediated communication tasks, dependent on their teaching goals. Among them were essays of all types, essay exams, research and term papers, promotional materials, letters, summaries and outlines, and a variety of exercises and dictations. Overall, participants reported that they are *not* satisfied with students' writing, either in foreign languages or in Russian. As one wrote, "Students' main weaknesses are a lack of logic, poor knowledge of styles and genres, and sometimes a lack of ideas." Overwhelmingly, everyone reported needing more time for students to practice writing and for teachers to grade writing. As one wrote, "I just need more hours. As to the materials or activities, they are in excess in English manuals and publications, with virtually none in Russian. So I am developing my own." Also overwhelmingly, they agreed that the kind of courses they would like to see introduced into their curricula are English for Academic Purposes (EAP),

writing across the curriculum (WAC), and writing in the disciplines (WID), with goals dependent on the year of students and their discipline of study.

Turning to their own preparation and writing, participants also reported having “a lot” to learn. One said, “I need to learn more about how writing is taught in the United States and other English-speaking countries. Reading or hearing about it does not provide enough information. Unfortunately, as neither of the universities I work for is interested in promoting such research (not on their own expense, at least), they would not pay for my training abroad.” (One achievement of the Summer School was the *enactment* of how writing is taught in the U.S.) Participants reported doing a wide range of writing beyond their teaching and administrative responsibilities: research articles, poetic translations, short stories, children’s books, and international educational projects. With regard to sharing their scholarly writing with colleagues, replies were mostly negative beyond proofreading. As one noted, “As far as I can see, scholarly writing tends to be a very ‘private affair.’” Discussion is mostly limited to students’ writing, while “those with a degree are considered to be competent and independent enough to deal with their writing tasks on their own.” (Another achievement of the Summer School was the *enacting* of the shared—and public—work of scholarly writing.)

Later and ongoing outcomes of the summer school

The dialogue we recount in the sections above—the interface of pre-event expectations and our interactions in the Summer School, the sharing of pedagogical strategies, and our discussions of our own and our students’ writing—created a strong basis for ongoing cross-cultural collaborations. Thus, a number of professional activities have occurred as a direct result of the Summer School.

- Marty and Kathy co-presented a report about the event at a pre-conference workshop of the 2014 Conference on College Composition and Communication (the national professional gathering of college writing teachers in the United States). The pre-conference workshop, held annually since 2008, at which they spoke focuses

on research about writing in higher education outside of the United States

- Tania, Diane, Marty, and Kathy presented papers at the 2014 Writing Research across Borders (WRAB) international conference in Paris. Informed of the conference during the collaboration in Moscow, Tania and Diane presented a joint paper on the difficulties of teaching university-level writing in Russia. (Venediktova and Nemeč Ignashev, 2014) Although only Tania and Diane’s presentation at WRAB emerged directly from the Summer School workshop (Kathy and Marty had had to submit their proposals earlier on), the four met at the conference to further discuss their Fulbright collaboration, with an eye toward the present article.

- Tania published a report on the Summer School’s proceedings in the Russian journal *Vysshee obrazovanie* [*Higher Education*] (Venediktova, 2014).

- Andrei Azov published a report on the Summer School in the journal *The New Literary Observer* (Azov, 2014).

- Hosted by Marty, one of the Summer School’s Russian participants spent six weeks at the University of Missouri in the fall of 2014. Tatiana Alenkina, from the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, worked with Marty while researching and writing a course and a manual for students at her university. *Academic Writing in the Sciences: Theory and Practice* is in production at Tatiana’s institution. Tatiana has also been invited to create an online version of the course for her university.

- At the conclusion of the Summer School, the Russian and U.S. collaborators discussed publishing a collection of standard American essays about academic writing in Russian to serve as background and guidance for Russian scholars of academic writing, although this project is not yet underway.

- Marty adopted several of Ron’s techniques for helping young faculty understand how to peer review one another’s work-in-progress when she conducted a writing workshop at the University of Alaska in January 2015.

- Ron conducted workshops on scholarly publishing in English at Shanghai International Studies University in the summer and fall of 2014 that benefited from the rich interchange at the Moscow Fulbright Summer School.

• Kathy, Marty, and Ron are considering a joint presentation on the Fulbright Summer School for the 2017 WRAB conference in Bogotá, Columbia. One likely focus for this presentation is a fuller discussion of the participants' survey responses, which we deal with only briefly in this essay, including how much we profited from our collaborations in Moscow (which this list instantiates).

• In 2015 Irina Korotkina (HSE/NRU), a participant in the seminar, published in Russian a textbook in academic writing at the university level—*Akademicheskoe pis'mo: protsess, produkt i praktika* [Academic Writing: Process, Product, and Praxis]—in which she engages ideas discussed during the workshop.

• And finally, this article itself serves as a reminder of the importance of international writing research and collaboration.

How the Fulbright Summer School affected the guest facilitators professionally

Ron's Reflections

The Fulbright Summer School was the latest of a good number of visits I have made to Russia, and it was one of the most fulfilling. My grandfather emigrated to the United States in the early twentieth century—now a little more than one hundred years ago—from what was then part of Russia, and my recent visits have been as exciting for me as my first visit to Moscow and Petersburg in 1995. I've engaged with colleagues and friends about American literature, American literary studies, and my work in Literature and Medicine. But it was particularly engaging at the Fulbright Summer School to work with people on ideas and arguments that were principally close to their hearts and minds. The excitement of encountering the focuses and methods of understanding that grow out of what can only be called ground-breaking rethinking of the most basic aspects of social and personal lives and institutions that Russians of the last few decades have participated in has widened my sense of the *kinds* of things we can think about and many new and exhilarating ways of thinking about them. The writing of my Russian colleagues and our shared engagements about their writing has been both "familiar" and "strange and new," almost in the way that the Russian Formalists, now many years ago,

taught us all a vocabulary for comprehending transformative experiences.

The kind of focused writing engagements we shared in the Summer School seminar reinforced my growing sense that structured writing needs to be a *daily* part of *any* non-laboratory course in higher education in the humanities and social sciences. At home I enjoin students to write for each class meeting. I've developed writing prompts for general education courses (such as "Introduction to Fiction"), courses in literary and cultural history (such as "The Irish Literary Revival"), courses that focus on language (such as "Speech-Act Theory"), and even courses that supplement students pursuing a scientific education (such as "Literature and Medicine" for our pre-med students). Such assignments, I have come to see, are strictly parallel to laboratory experiences for students in the sciences: they offer "hands-on" experience with rhetoric, argumentative discourse, and critical thinking, even if they are not practicable in large lecture courses (just as laboratory work is not practicable in large, lecture introductory courses in the sciences). But if large courses include weekly breakout sessions (where smaller sections of large courses meet with teaching assistants on a weekly basis), *weekly* writing can and should be structured into instruction. Finally, the Summer School focus on WAC has led me, with my colleague, Jerry Vannatta, MD, to develop a text-anthology for reading and writing that can be taught by instructors in medical colleges to bring humanistic understanding to students training to become physicians. Our book, *Teaching Narrative for Medical Education*, is under consideration with a publisher.

Marty's Reflections

My thoughts during the Summer School often migrated to the early days of the writing across the curriculum movement in the United States when composition faculty were mounting the first WAC workshops for their discipline-based colleagues. Under the leadership of people like Art Young, Toby Fulwiler, Barbara Walvoord, Elaine Maimon, and the progenitor of them all, Harriet Sheridan at Pennsylvania's Beaver College (now Arcadia), those early days when the WAC movement was just coming into being were intellectually

stimulating and pedagogically vibrant. For many composition faculty, this was an early encounter with their discipline-based colleagues' experience of writing in their classrooms. I imagined that the Summer School in Russia had to be a little like those events, with participants engaging in lively conversation and exchanging new insights. I enjoyed seeing our Russian participants recognize that they alone do not have to carry the full burden of teaching writing to every student in every discipline, that faculty in disciplines other than language can share this responsibility and, indeed, are often eager to do so when shown the principles that U.S. WAC proponents have been sharing for over three decades. I also appreciated that, like participants those early U.S. WAC workshops, we too enjoyed the local cultural milieu with our fellow teachers: an evening boat tour on the Moskva River, a performance of Tchaikovsky's Yevgeny Onegin at the Moscow New Opera Theatre, and a leisurely stroll through Gorky Park followed by a lively brainstorming session with our Russian colleagues at an eatery by the water's edge.

My lasting impressions include how hard my Russian counterparts work, their ability to concentrate through adversity, their stalwart attitudes and agreeable demeanor when the week's record rain and the heat combined to make the Journalism laboratory almost unbearable. I have enormous respect for these colleagues with whom it was a privilege to work. They were selected in a highly competitive process, were hugely talented, open to new ideas and finding new solutions. They cited the same concerns as do their American peers about student writing and the same desire to address them. I wished for even more leisure time to get to know our Russian colleagues, interact socially with them, know more about their schools, homes, lifestyles, and families. I wanted to hear their personal stories about how they became teachers and what teaching means to them. I realize that we have only just begun to tap into the possibilities for collaboration with our Russian colleagues, and I very much want to continue.

Kathy's Reflections

Since the Fulbright Summer School, I have softened my views on the importance of first-year composition as a

site for the teaching of writing. I have shifted my disciplinary stance more towards the abolition of the first-year writing course requirement (Crowley); I embraced Marty's WAC and WID perspectives (Townsend). From both pedagogical and labor perspectives, the slow movement away from first-year composition might be a needed change.

I was humbled, once again, by the persistent and globally-recognized challenges of teaching writing. We commiserated about how to improve student writing with our Russian colleagues, many of whom had travelled by train for days to be at this Summer School. I felt as if we were hoping to find the latest "inoculation" course, strategy, or book that would ameliorate the laborious process of learning writing for students and teachers; however, now we were looking for a "global inoculation." We, the Americans, did not bring the solution; and our Russian colleagues, wisely, did not proffer an answer either.

While I cannot claim any direct changes in my classroom practices, the Fulbright Summer School experience encouraged me in the following ways. As director of English and writing at my campus, I am planning incremental changes to my campus's writing program that take into consideration the limitations of first-year composition. I plan to include the Writing about Writing concept (Wardle and Downs) as well as to build on the research by Zemeliensky, Goroshko, and St Amant.

Organizers' Expectations and Comments on the Outcomes of the Summer School

Tania's Reflections

Organizing each consecutive year's Fulbright Summer School begins almost immediately upon completion of the last one. Over the years we have tried to coordinate the schools to reflect state of the art pedagogical and research advances abroad, in the United States in particular, as well as to address the needs and the contexts of our Russian participants. In addition to thanking Marty, Kathy, and Ron for finding the time and wherewithal to spend a week with us in Moscow, I must also acknowledge the staff at the Fulbright representation in Moscow and at the Faculty of Philology, and all our colleagues and students in the department who each year help make the summer schools so effective. As for other

members of the organizing team in 2013, words cannot express my gratitude for their intense commitment, patience, and—when needed—sense of humor.

From the vantage of a veteran of the Russian educational system—as student, teacher, and administrator—I viewed the 2013 topic as a means by which to further acknowledge writing pedagogy within the Russian higher educational system as equally important as the teaching of reading, each half of the discourse model, to paraphrase Teun van Dijk, providing access to another’s consciousness. Writing depends not only on the mastery of grammatical rules, stylistic norms, and generally accepted conventions. It requires constant reflection on the writing act itself as a means of participating in an exchange of world-views and of whole worlds. As Russian higher education strives to participate more fully in the international research community, our scholars are called upon not merely to submit grammatically sufficient translations of their work, but to incorporate in the positioning of their research their respective research communities’ various modes and (often unwritten) rules of discourse. Rather than regard this as submitting to some ineffable process known as “globalization,” I believe that we should strive to an exchange, incorporating into our writing in our native languages best practices from research and writing communities around the world. And, as we teach ourselves, we must engage our students in similar writing exercises that will open up for them additional venues for intellectual exchange. Such at least were the goals that underlay the 2013 Summer School.

Diane’s Reflections

Having worked in the Department of Discourse and Communications Studies for a year, which included courses in academic writing, and helped organize the 2012 Fulbright Summer School, I looked forward to working with Tania and Olga again, hoping as well to learn better from our American guests and the Russian participants how better to approach writing instruction in my own classes in Russia. It is this last, collaborative, moment that strikes me as most memorable and productive about the schools. Our facilitators’ success could be measured tangibly by the amount, volume, and speed of

conversation taking place during breaks, at lunch, and in informal meetings. Which of the techniques presented in the talks would work better (at all) in the Russian classroom? What were the assumptions (from number of class meetings per week to requirement systems and university structure) that facilitated one set of strategies in one country but impeded them in another? For me these “informal” conversations with people I had met virtually through the surveys weeks before were as significant as the presentations.

Olga’s Reflections

In the summer of 2013 I was finishing my two-year term in Moscow as founding director of the Writing and Communication Center and Lecturer in English at the New Economic School (NES). My plan was to leave Moscow in May, but when Tania approached me with the proposition to organize the upcoming Fulbright Summer School for the Humanities around the topic of writing pedagogy at the university level, I quickly changed my summer plans and stayed.

Having worked with Russian faculty, administrators, and students at NES and beyond, I saw a tremendous interest in developing writing-centered or writing-enhanced courses, teaching practices, and learning habits. At the same time, I noticed among Russian faculty only a slight acquaintance with the developments in composition theory, a field of study that has been evolving in the United States for decades. Similarly, writing colleagues in the United States didn’t seem fully aware of the Russian rhetorical traditions. In short, I saw a profound need for and dreamed of creating a forum for Russian and international writing professionals to begin developing a common vocabulary and recognizable repertoire of methodologies, so a fruitful dialogue and collaboration could unfold. I was thrilled to see that Tania shared this vision and was determined to bring it to life in the Summer School.

Before the arrival of Marty, Kathy, and Ron, the organizers—Tania, Diane, Elena and I—spent long hours planning the event in the cozy conference room at the Department of Discourse and Communication at MSU. We were setting the stage for a larger and longer conversation that was soon joined—and fortunately still continues—by the

American guests and Summer School participants.

Recommendations to others planning inter-cultural writing workshops

1. Begin planning as far in advance as you can. For the U.S. team, arriving at the content was fairly straightforward, based on information that the Moscow organizing team had been mulling over for several months.

2. Establish the goals and desired outcomes as clearly as possible early on. Although we U.S. presenters didn't experience any last minute crises in what or how to present our material, we did occasionally wonder whether the event was what our Russian hosts expected. Anticipate that your collaborators' expectations might evolve or be reinterpreted as the event unfolds.

3. Accept that your event won't be perfect, that it is part of an ongoing process, and that the next iteration (whether yours or someone else's) will be different and probably better. Your work may be occurring at the early stage of what hopefully will become a durable effort.

4. Incorporate time for social and cultural exploration in addition to the academic foci. Without culture, language is empty.

5. Envision your workshop as an opportunity to build lifelong personal and relationships. Eight months after the workshop, Marty and Kathy shared time in Paris, France, with Tania and Diane at the WRAB conference. To this day the Moscow organizers continue to be in contact with participants. Building international networks takes significant energy and resources and should be sustained, even as international circumstances change.

6. Clarify your understanding of proprietary materials and copyright with your hosts. Notions of intellectual property vary around the world.

7. Plan and scaffold your inter-cultural workshops into teaching lessons for graduate classes though the use of

ongoing blogs, e-journals, websites, and articles.

8. Invite qualified students to play significant roles in the event, especially with technology. Our week was successful in large part due to the technological expertise of Andrei Azov, who in addition to participating fully in our deliberations simultaneously facilitated PowerPoint projection, videotaped our sessions, and ensured that material was archived for our future use.

9. Assess technology requirements as early as possible. Our event required not only banks of computers and projectors on site; compiling survey data and distributing reading assignments would have been impossible without Adobe Acrobat or a comparable program. Skype calls were essential for clarifying goals.

10. Expect glitches and be flexible. We grow when we work outside our comfort zones.

11. Travel arrangements took considerable time; be sure to plan ahead, particularly if visas are involved.

Conclusion

In presenting this case study of our collaboration, we hope we have inspired other colleagues around the globe to undertake similar intercultural exchanges. We recognize that ours is but one model, an imperfect one at that. We acknowledge that geopolitical events may complicate this work. Yet we can think of no better time to get started nor any better cause to tackle than students' and faculty's needs to communicate more effectively in academe and beyond. Two years after our collaboration, we have seen significant outcomes from our work and we anticipate more to come. We welcome reading reports of other intercultural collaborations in the realm of academic writing and are eager for insights from other researcher/practitioner scholars to be added to our own.

LITERATURE

1. Academic Writing: Perspectives from Russia and the U.S., 2013, XVI Fulbright Summer School in the Humanities. Available at: <http://discours.philol.msu.ru/uploadedfiles/summer/summer2013/Program-2013.pdf> (accessed 12 December 2015).
2. Azov, A., 2014, Fulbriatovskaia mezhdunarodnaia gumanitarnaia letniaia shkola "Akademicheskoe pis'mo: Aktual'nyi mezhdunarodnyi opyt" [The Fulbright International Humanities Summer School "Academic Writing: International Experience"]. Moscow, MSU, 24-2. January 2013, *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* [New

- Literary Observer*. No. 125, January 2014. Available at: <http://www.nlobooks.ru/node/4614> (accessed 15 March 2015).
3. Bean, J.C., 2011, Engaging Ideas, *The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
 4. Berry, P. W., Hawisher, G.E., Selfe, C.L., 2012. *Transnational Literate Lives in Digital Times*. [Online] Logan, UT: Computers and Composition Digital Press/Utah State University Press. Available at: <http://ccdigitalpress.org/transnational/> (accessed 15 March 2015)
 5. Canagarajah, A.S., 2007, The ecology of global English. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1(2), pp. 89-100.
 6. Crowley, S., 1998, *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press.
 7. *Dartmouth Institute for Writing and Rhetoric. Active Learning in the First-Year Writing Classroom*. Available at: <https://writing-speech.dartmouth.edu/teaching/first-year-writing-pedagogies-methods-design/active-learning-first-year-writing-classroom> (accessed 17th April 2015).
 8. Fulwiler, T., 1981, Showing, not telling, at a writing workshop, *College English*, 43(1), pp. 55-63.
 9. Fulwiler, T., 1989, Writing workshops and the mechanics of change. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 12 (spring), pp. 7-20.
 10. Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J.J., Trimbur, J., 2011, Opinion: Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach. *College English*, 73(3). Available at: <https://louisville.edu/faculty/bmhorn01/TranslingualStatement.pdf>(accessed 23 March 2015).
 11. *Laboratorium: Russian Review of Social Research*. Available at: <http://www.soclabo.org/index.php/laboratorium> (accessed 30th September 2014).
 12. *Moscow State University: 16th Annual Fulbright Summer School in the Humanities*. 2013. Available at: <http://discours.philol.msu.ru/index.php/summer-school-current-eng/11-summer-school/109-school-2013-eng>(accessed 28th February 2015).
 13. *Moscow State University: 16th Annual Fulbright Summer School in the Humanities*. 2013. Available at: <http://www.fulbright.ru/> (accessed 28th February 2015).
 14. Kafedra obshhej teorii slovesnosti. Publikacii. Available at: <http://discours.philol.msu.ru/index.php/summer-school-publications-english> (accessed 28th February 2015).
 15. McLeod, S., 2007, *Writing Program Administration*. Lafayette, Parlor Press. Available at: http://wac.colostate.edu/books/mcleod_wpa/wpa.pdf(accessed 28th February 2015).
 16. Schleifer, R., 2000, *Analogical Thinking: Post-Enlightenment Understanding in Language, Collaboration, and Interpretation*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
 17. Townsend, M., 2013, What are writing across the curriculum and writing in the disciplines? *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators*, pp. 77-90.
 18. Venediktova T.D., 2013, Uroki pis'ma v transnatsional'noi perspektive: Opyt Chikagskogo universiteta [Writing Lessons in a Transnational Perspective: The University of Chicago Experience]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, № 8-9, pp. 116-119. Available at: http://rus.neicon.ru:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/8361/17_%238-9_2013_%D1%81-17.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed 15 May 2015).
 19. Venediktova T.D., 2014, Pis'mo - global'naiia problema i zabota [Writing: Global Problem and Concern], *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, № 5, pp. 156-159. http://rus.neicon.ru:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/9875/%2314-5_%D0%92%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B5%D0%B4%D0%B8%D0%BA%D1%82%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0_%D1%81_156-159.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed 15 May 2015).
 20. Venediktova, T., Nemeč Ignashev, D., 2014, *(Un)learning Literature through the Literary Essay. Writing Research Across Borders III*. 18-22 February 2014. Paris, Université Paris-Ouest Nanterre La Défense.
 21. Wardle, E., Downs, D., 2011, *Writing about Writing: A College Reader*. Boston: Bedford St. Martin's.
 22. *Writing Research across Borders III (WRAB) Conference*. 19th-22nd February 2014. Paris, Université Paris-Ouest Nanterre La Défense.

23. Young, A., 2003, Poetry Across the Curriculum: A special issue of *The Journal of Language and Literature Across the Disciplines*, Vol 6, No. 2, June. Republished by WAC Clearinghouse. Available at: <http://wac.colostate.edu/llad> (accessed 15 May 2015).
24. Zemeliansky, P., Goroshko, O. The state of academic writing instruction in Russia and Ukraine: A Survey. Available at: http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=5&ved=0CDEQFjAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcompfaqs.org%2Fuploads%2FCompFAQsInternational%2F2013CCCCWorkshopOnInternationalResearch%2FAcademicWritingRussiaUkraine.doc&ei=AAr6VOvdMIOVyQSdvYGOBA&usg=AFQjCNGV_asOo-c1sVY4rqhUA0WvUyrJRA&sig2=MdDeRReUjnUfcqXco-XhmQ (accessed 28th February 2014).
25. Zemeliansky, P., St. Amant, K., 2013, The state of technical communication in the former USSR: A review of literature. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, (43(3), pp. 237-260.