Original Research

Teaching academic writing: A shift towards intercultural rhetoric

by Elina S. Chuikova

Elina S. Chuikova Samara Branch of Moscow State Pedagogical University chuikova_elina@mail.ru

New trends in cross-cultural studies are aimed at the analysis and definition of interculture that is generated in a classroom in the process of cultural integration. Academic writing interculture remains a potentially appealing area for research since this topical issue is almost neglected in the Russian-English interactive teaching context. Sociocultural peculiarities of the English and Russian rhetorical traditions have been thoroughly investigated by the English-speaking and native scholars. However, the characteristics of a new culture formed by the merging of different traditions are under discussion. Intercultural rhetoric brings a new and expended view on writing culture and requires further research. The paper presents statics on the basis of Master's students' texts, estimates which elements of academic writing merge. The author studies various levels of cultural mismatches, discusses if the integration tendencies take place at any of text creation levels, and argues that authenticity coupled with individuality pertains greatly to the quality of academic texts. In conclusion the tendencies and changes in academic writing style and individual thinking style of the Russian students are summarised. The results indicate the formation of two major characteristics in academic intercultural communication: individuality and authenticity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Intercultural communication tends to blur boundaries between the engaged cultures. Taken for granted the fact that cultures initially possess their specific features, researchers in the field of cross-cultural studies realised that cultures merge into one. Consequently, the epoch of cross-cultural studies has been replaced by intercultural ones. The term 'intercultural rhetoric' is now considered as *'the most appropriate name for this area of study that provides an appropriate connotation of collaborative interaction between and among cultures'* (Connor, 2011). A new scientific paradigm inevitably influences a foreign language (FL) teaching practice; and the area of teaching academic writing is not an exception. The writing classroom based on English for academic purposes (EAP) presents a unique case in which the predo-

minant role of Anglo-American rhetoric is getting less obvious. There appeared *'signs of English educational discourse denationalisation through the absorption of foreign and foreigner-oriented elements, which is an inevitable consequence of English 'going global'* (Kharkovskaya et al., 2017, p. 75). The features of a written discourse undergo some changes and acquire a new meaning in intercultural interpretation. Initially, cross-cultural studies focused on the Anglo-American way of logic development. Nowadays, intercultural papers single out other areas to discuss; mostly style and academic genres (Connor, 2011). The aim of this article is to make an inventory of academic writing elements that tend to interact while Russian students learn to write in English.

Since intercultural studies are in trend, researchers look into intercultural rhetorical elements in FL classrooms with the Japanese, Chinese, Indian, Saudi Arabian students. Much work is done and based on various Asian cultural traditions (Bardhan, 2016; Liu & Du, 2018; Zabihi et al., 2019). European researches in the field of intercultural communication also present skills transformed within the process of cross-cultural exchange in educational programmes (Yarosh et al., 2018; Ene et al., 2019). However, it is unclear how academic writing elements are incorporated into the Russian educational system: which of them are adapted, and which remain alien and require special training.

We have adopted teaching writing traditions from English-speaking specialists: namely, types of classroom writing performance, types of assessment, teaching rhetorical and style conventions. Still, the situation remains unique in terms of the aims of teaching writing, the approaches taken to teach writing, and the stages that the writer comes through in the process of writing. In fact, Russian teaching EAP writing is a combination of teaching writing conventions in native teaching tradition and ideas of the English-speaking scholars who suggest teaching with cultural peculiarities in mind. Half of the century ago there were developed the principles within the process-oriented approach, and prewriting-drafting-revising strategy of

teaching writing was first implemented in Russian language classrooms. Nowadays these ideas are commonly used in the English writing classes as well, but without a clear picture of how some rules of one written culture merge into another. The article hopes to initiate the research within the Russian scholars interested in intercultural rhetoric.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The research material presented in the study includes a scope of students' works. The students took part in Master's degree programme 'Foreign Languages in Education' in 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 academic years at Moscow City University (Samara Branch). The experimental work was arranged in the Foreign Language Department and lasted for 2 academic years. It involved 28 students who, by the end of the programme, had to compile a story of their research and to present it in the annotated form. The groups of students were heterogeneous. Students who graduated from Samara Branch of Moscow City University had had previously a basic course of academic writing. In contrast, students graduating from other higher institutions in the region may have had no essential experience in academic writing. To assess the results the following steps were to be taken:

– culture specific elements of academic writing needed systemising;

– a course of academic writing needed planning and organisation;

– there was a need to develop the descriptors to assess text authenticity and measure its deviation from the model one; we used statistics to estimate which elements of English academic written culture were adapted to a greater extent by Master's students.

Students taking Academic writing course imitate model texts and language patterns. Subconsciously they compare the way they communicate in the academic context in their native language culture. *'Learners can mimic the behavioural patterns of that community derived from the authentic text to a certain extent since the first goal is to communicate and not to behave like someone else*

which means somehow losing one's social and linguistic identity' (Ciornei & Dina, 2015, p. 275).

The aim of students' academic texts analysis was to pinpoint the elements of writing interculture in the classroom with the Russian students.

3. STUDY AND RESULTS

3.1. Systemising culture-specific elements of academic writing

To address the research questions suggested above, along with an argumentative writing task, two other instruments were required: one measuring authenticity of an academic text, and another one measuring what elements of the English academic written culture were adapted. The research procedure required developing a scheme and descriptors to analyse students' texts quality.

Connor (2011) mentions the shift that intercultural rhetoric has made recently having found peculiar features of a written discourse beyond its logical structuring. Specific elements are also identified in style and in genre interpretation as well as in language implementation: *'genre analysis and corpus linguistics have been brought into intercultural rhetoric'* (Connor, 2011, p. 5). A more detailed classification of sociocultural mismatches may be presented in the form of hierarchy. There were numerous attempts to systemise the levels of text creation, at which various sociocultural mismatches appear (Table 1).

Table1
Text levels where sociocultural mismatches exist

LEVELS	KARAULOV (1989)	BIEVA (1982)	BROOKES AND GRUNDY (1991)	SIEPMANN (2006)
Communicative task interpretation	Motivational / Pragmatic level		Sociology of writing	Cross-cultural difference in thought
Idea selection	Linguo-cognitive level	Background knowledge of a person		
Organisation		Semantic organisation and structuring	Organisation level	Cross-cultural difference in writing patterns
Language	Verbal-semantic level	Language level of a person	Language level	

In analysing various classifications / text models describing levels where sociocultural differences might be found, it is possible to distinguish levels that overlap in the presented studies. These are the four levels as listed below:

– interpretation of the communicative task level: task / thesis / genre mismatches;

– organisation level: linear English writing vs non-linear Russian style of writing;

– idea selection level: the material should be credible and familiar or clearly explained to the potential audience of another culture;

– language choice level: choice of academic words collocations, choice of grammar (Chuikova, 2017, 2018).

At any level of text production cultural literacy should be defined further. Students' works frequently contain sociocultural mismatches at the linguistic and organisational levels. Obviously, motivation or pragmatic reasons are not explicitly realised in the text, yet cross-cultural mismatches at other levels may be distinguished (Table 2).

As was previously mentioned, the groups of Master's students were heterogeneous. Some of the students lacked the essential basic experience in academic writing ('non-academic' students). They did not get acquainted with the requirements for academic texts till the moment they actually faced the need to publish the results of their own research in English.

Table 2

Sociocultural mismatches in academic texts of Master's students

TEXT LEVEL	ELEMENTS OF THE ACADEMIC TEXT REALISED AT THE LEVEL
Organisation	– text structure should correspond to the genre; – basic requirements are met (thesis statement, topic sentence, framing); – logical arguments organisation.
Idea selection	– relevance of research topic; – original ideas; – argumentative, source-based writing.
Language	– academic vocabulary; – professional vocabulary; – high lexical density; – active grammar forms; – variety in syntax structures; – hedging; – avoidance of non-qualified statements; – overall language competence: use of grammar and vocabulary.

3.2. Planning and organising an Academic Writing course for Master's students

At the University Master's students are supposed to take an elective course of Academic Writing. Additionally, some formats of academic writing / text genres are discussed, studied and created within other disciplines: English for Professional Purposes, Speech Practice in a Foreign Language. The genres in which Master's students have practice are abstracts and summaries. Students are supposed to write summaries or profession-oriented articles in the field of students' research as well as to write their own articles which present researchers' original ideas. To prepare students for professional communication at the intercultural level, they should experience an extensive training that will ensure effective real-life interaction. The chosen genres for students' practice are the most typical ones for applying EAP in Russia.

The linguists who follow Noam Chomsky's theory of language acquisition consider a language to be not primarily a tool for communication. A language might present a system or subsystem of thought. Thus, at the post-graduate stage of studies creative thinking skills are developed alongside with academic language skills: *'Creative thinking encompasses a range of intellectual abilities including the ability to generate numerous ideas (fluency), produce ideas of various types (flexibility),* *build on existing ideas (elaboration), and produce original ideas (originality)'* (Paul & Elder, 2019, p. 58). Students who have already had a preliminary Academic Writing course at Bachelor's level gained more opportunities to work at the original content, at the process of generating ideas. On the contrary, 'non-academic' students were to spend time on studying general requirements of academic writing, learn the ABC of Anglo-American rhetoric tradition (Table 3).

The requirements for academic texts in Anglo-American tradition, including the unwritten rules of academic discourse, have been thoroughly analysed in recent years. For instance, hedging was a new phenomenon that Russian writing instructors faced within the framework of contrastive rhetoric a decade ago. Nowadays, hedging is known as one of the types of vague language use. Thus, McGee (2018) lists three types of vague expressions including vague categories, approximations and hedging. Other researches point out that hedging is implemented differently in various types of discourse. In the academic context Gribanova and Gaidukova (2019) analyse 'approximators' or 'rounders'. Some of them are used in case the exact or precise information is of no importance to the speaker, as in *almost, about, approximately and something between*, while others disclaim responsibility for the general truth of the information

Table 3

Contents of Academic Writing course for Master's students

ESSENTIAL TOPICS FOR STUDENTS HAVING TAKEN PRELIMINARY ACADEMIC WRITING COURSE AT BACHELOR'S LEVEL	ESSENTIAL TOPICS FOR 'NON-ACADEMIC' STUDENTS
Academic communication in Russia: potential application of academic writing competence	
	Structuring argumentation in English: thesis statement, topic, types of arguments
	Anglo-American linear way of thinking
Academic genres: abstract, summary, article, speech writing	
Structural elements of academic texts: background information, material, research methods, presenting results, practical application	
	Academic language style (basic requirements): tone of formality, syntax, academic vocabulary
Elements of style (professional requirements): professional terminology, language density, hedging, active grammar, authorial voice, correction of non-qualified statements	

conveyed in the utterance, as in *I think, I take it, probably, as far as I can tell, right now, I have to believe, I don't see that.*

Therefore, having distinguished specific elements of English academic writing style, a few researchers study further which of these elements have been incorporated into the culture they 'communicate' with, i.e. which elements have been adapted by non-English students. To understand why some requirements of academic context are adapted while others remain ignored is seemingly the next possible stage in intercultural studies.

3.3. Developing the descriptors to assess students' works authenticity

To assess students' works authenticity, a scheme of descriptors and a new system of calculating were introduced into the experimental teaching practice. The coefficient of academic text authenticity (C_{ata}) discloses the interrelations between students' ability to create original text, their academic literacy and ability to present academic skills in another cultural context, not a native one (Chuikova, 2018).

In assessing text authenticity, we followed three essential requirements to academic writing.

1. A writer should provide a reader with an original content / idea, which is derived from understanding a primary function of an academic text as a critical evaluation of the given facts and building new knowledge. The indicators that allow to assess original content are specified further:

– how autonomous a writer is in the choice of a topical issue;

– how autonomous a writer is in the choice of the sources to base research on;

– how original the ideas are, i.e. if a writer does not merely report, but rather analyses the evidence from the selected sources;

– if a writer is able to present a dialogue of different viewpoints in the content that indicates author's professional outlook;

– if there is a dialogue of old and new theories or approaches organised as a discussion in a text;

– if the prospects for practical implementation of the ideas are suggested in a text;

– if a writer is able to highlight the perspectives for further research on the topic.

In fact, the descriptors of the text originality in-

dicate the author's competence in the sphere of their research, ability to find a personal niche in this sphere, and ability to present their individual vision on the discussed issues. All the skills that allow to create an original text form the so-called 'authorial voice' – *'individual voice in L2 texts in terms of assertiveness, self-identification, reiteration of the central idea, and writer presence and autonomy of thought'* (Zabihi et al., 2019, p. 333).

2. A writer should follow strict requirements to academic texts, i.e. they should possess academic literacy. Academic literacy that assists in achieving context authenticity is a heterogeneous criterion. The conventions accepted in an academic context and shaping our academic writing competence include student's autonomy at different stages of text creation: autonomy in brainstorming, outlining, writing, editing, rewriting and presenting a text; structuring skills; style of writing; manner of presenting final results after self-editing (Chuikova, 2019).

Writers possess academic literacy if they are able to identify the topic of a text, select material, formulate a thesis statement, choose suitable and credible arguments, structure a text of an academic genre, edit the text themselves, submit the assignment in time, work with editor's proofs, and reflect on final results. This minimal set of skills is gradually developed in students within the course of academic writing. No one expects a student to be absolutely autonomous in this process. As a result, a coefficient of academic literacy of a beginner writer is lower of that of an experienced researcher who has already got published.

In outlining and further writing, the author requires knowledge and skills of structuring academic texts. Text structure should fit the specific genre requirements. The common requirements to any academic text should also be met (topic statement, framing). Logical arguments should be organised in the traditions of Anglo-American rhetorical style. Understanding the fact that English is the only 100%-writer responsible language adds greatly to skills of structuring ideas in a linear way.

While moving through all the stages of text creation, a writer should not forget the fixed for-mal requirements for academic style of writing: use of academic vocabulary, professional vocabulary, information density, active grammar forms, syntax structures variability, hedging, avoidance of non-qualified statements.

Language formality does not exclude language competence in the use of grammar and vocabulary which are proofread and corrected before presenting the final draft. Work presentation skills assist in making correct title page, organising in-text citations and references.

3. Cultural literacy is characterised by writer's ability to adapt to culturally-determined requirements in the academic context while switching from a native language into a foreign one. This ability is persistently developed through cross-cultural analysis of writing conventions, reading and analysing model texts and extracts. The practice of cross-cultural analysis enhances editing skills and informs of written and unwritten rules in writing academic texts.

Possible cultural mistakes are presented in Table 2 and may be classified according to the level of a text where they may be found:

– at the motivation level: task / thesis / genre mismatches;

– at the content level: the author checks if the material is credible and easy to be perceived / understood by potential audience belonging to another culture;

– at the organisation level: the representatives of a contrastive rhetoric distinguish differences in the style people of different cultures use in thinking and presenting their ideas;

– at the linguistic level: our L2 accent is obvious, for instance, through some mismatches in the use of academic words collocations, passive constructions instead of active grammar, complex syntax typical for the Russian language instead of precise syntax in English.

Using the formula to calculate the coefficient of text authenticity (Chuikova, 2018) we may estimate the average level of text authenticity in Master's students:

$$C_{ata} = \frac{content\ authenticity + academic\ literacy}{sociocultural\ mismatches\ in\ written\ communication}$$

All the participants are native speakers of Russian and are studying English as an academic major. Out of 28 participants, 14 were the students who entered Moscow City University (Samara Branch) after graduating other higher institutions. They had no previous experience of taking a special course in Academic Writing. In the results interpretation they are indicated as non-academic students. Admittedly, they had some knowledge of writing academic texts, but it was non-systematic and insufficient as it was gained mostly through uncontrolled written practice. Academic Writing course at the post-graduate stage was the first time for non-academic students when they got a professional extensive feedback on their writing competence and guided practice in writing competence development.

In order to measure students' texts authenticity an analytical scoring was used. The coefficient of academic text authenticity C_{ata} may vary from 1 to 20.

Bachelor's students are usually assessed within the score from 1.5 to 3.5, Master's students show the results within the bands from 4 to 11, professional writes may have a score higher than 12 (Table 4).

Table 4
Dynamics of C_{ata} coefficient in Academic Writing course

GROUPS OF MASTER'S STUDENTS	PRE-COURSE MEAN (OUT OF 20)	POST-COURSE MEAN (OUT OF 20)	MAX
Students who took preliminary Academic Writing course at Bachelor's level 2017/2018	3.8	9.9	10.5
Non-academic' students 2017/2018	2.7	7.1	7.8
Students who took preliminary Academic Writing course at Bachelor's level 2018/2019	3.6	10.2	11
Non-academic' students 2018/2019	2.9	7.9	8.5

Low level of academic literacy that non-academic students had before taking a course did not allow them to reach results compatible with those of students who had had a preliminary Academic Writing course. Still the progress is obvious in both groups of students. Analytical rubrics that were used to assess students' original content, academic literacy and cultural literacy assisted in estimating which elements of text production were better corrected and adapted by Master's students. Among the elements that contribute most to the increase of text authenticity are those adding to academic text originality:

– structuring abstracts / articles: Master's students get new experience experimenting with profession-oriented text genres;

– topicality of the research topic: at this stage students gain a more profound knowledge in their field and, luckily, successfully find their niche for a research;

– original ideas: by this time students start designing model classes, a succession of lessons or a module to teach; practical implementation of a theoretically designed system brings certain results; being new, this experience and its description and presentation in the articles increase the amount of the original material;

– source-based writing: regardless language competency level most students refer to literature review as the type of argumentation; referencing or 'academic honesty' (Thompson et al., 2017) pertains greatly to academic text authenticity;

– practical implementation of the ideas: some students may have already tried practicing new ideas in the educational process; in case they are still forming theoretical base for their research, they should set realistic goals and see the potential area for application of their ideas, i.e. their practical value;

– professional vocabulary: reading sources in the research area, students subconsciously learn professional terminology and most typical professional phrases and word collocations;

– active grammar forms, personal statements: it was estimated that students with high skills in academic language display higher results due to their academic language competence; however, these language elements cause a clash in students' minds as they present straight the opposite culture-marked feature, i.e. collectivism vs individualism.

4. DISCUSSION

Master's students aspire to reinforce their language skills and prefer to have additional language practice. Unfortunately, half of students perceive Academic Writing course as part of their language education that is aimed at the development of their overall language skills and communicative competence. However, step by step they realise that the course provides them with the specific knowledge and skills which they may further employ in their teaching or science career paths. In recent years the wring programme preparing students for the international communication has moved to teaching students to produce texts of distinctive patterns and of a particular style. Researchers revealed that students gain new knowledge and skills through their writing and editing practice.

An organised and guided peer revision may raise students' awareness in four areas: (1) awareness of an academic text genre they give their peer feedback on; (2) academic writing skills required at all text creation levels; (3) awareness of external assistance that may serve as a basis for students' potential growth as academic writers; and (4) an opportunity to become a more reflective and critical academic writer (Yu, 2019).

'Taking Academic Writing course, a learner receives a unique chance to raise their awareness in professional editing'

The last area covers students' way in finding their niche and gaining autonomy of thought, which is interpreted as searching for the authorial voice (Zabihi et al., 2019). Taking Academic Writing course, a learner receives a unique chance to raise their awareness in professional editing. To make every peer review section as productive as possible, a writing instructor generally provides students with specifically designed guidelines that teaches them what aspects of the text they should focus on, how they can assess various aspects of writing and what details they should pay attention to in other writers' works. Further this knowledge may transform into a deeper knowledge of the aspects that students should assess and edit in their own texts before submitting an assignment or presenting it in public.

Practicing two roles of a writer and an expert reader, academic writing students gain an opportunity to continue studies at the Russian and foreign institutions of higher education, to apply for a place of a writing tutor in a writing centre, to design and organise the course of Academic Writing, to participate in the international events in their research careers.

Learning the conventions of intercultural communication, Russian students also adapt some elements of a new style of thinking studied by intercultural rhetoric. The intercultural area in Academic Writing class in Russia is mostly extended by the original content and the author's original style of writing. Some elements of language use and style are adapted, shaping an individual style in the native culture as well.

Previously, the methods of cross-cultural rhetoric used to orient any culture to the potential audience needs. Further, intercultural rhetoric researchers assumed that *'a speaker's public image might not require significant attention when the topic involves collectivistic cultures'* (Bardhan, 2016, p. 4). Nowadays we may start analysing a new

tendency. The incorporation of Anglo-American rhetoric tradition resulted in the fact that scientific journals in Russia have started requiring more precise and more factual data-based writing. The novelty of the work and personal researcher's contribution is of great demand. Fortunately, taking academic writing course in English helps the author disclose their contribution. The style of writing in most cases becomes more individual.

Finding the authorial voice has always been considered an important task for a writing student. However, finding the individual style in EAP wring classes involves peculiar qualitative characteristics. It requires skilful work on argumentation as the most distinctive feature. Some scholars are doubtful on the possibility and necessity to develop individual writing style in the course of foreign language writing practice (Zabihi et al., 2019, p. 236). To explain a negative perception, it is vital to list other elements of the authorial voice are reflected in the author's ability to choose individually: topic, niche, arguments, and credible sources. Sometimes students from a different cultural tradition *'largely resist to what the instructor had taught in class about evidence use'* (Liu & Du, 2018). Thus, difficulties of interiorising in a new sphere of English application (EAP) is coupled with sociocultural mismatches. However, Russian students add considerable individuality to the text as soon as they learn new strategies to develop their voice in writing. No resistance was shown within the course of Academic Writing for Master's students. The strategy of adapting to a new more straightforward and individualistic style turns to be highly efficient, as an authorial voice is assessed as *'a significant predictor of text quality'* (Zhao, 2017).

5. CONCLUSION

In general, writing academic texts in English sharpens students' minds. The practice of writing for academic purposes builds the author's individual style and teaches them to be original and credible. This implication requires further detailed research, namely: (1) to be certain that while learning to write academic texts students also practice and find their authorial voice, we need to

define how we evaluate an authorial voice, what descriptors indicate that it really exists and/or that it gradually develops; (2) to make a credible conclusion that in Russian practice of teaching Anglo-American academic discourse an authorial voice raises as a part of intercultural communication practice, we should describe those particular elements in the structure of an authorial voice that do not normally characterise a native writing culture.

Data analysis provided by Morton and Storch (2019), Zabihi et al. (2019), Zhao (2017) shows that at both secondary and postsecondary levels an authorial voice is assessed by the tutors as a crucial element of an authentic, original text. Whether we need *'to support or refute the proposition that voice is an important concept to teach in L2 writing classrooms'* (Zhao, 2017) remains a point of discussion. However, subconsciously writing tutors assess students' voices and to which extent they are clear enough to produce an effect on a reader. There is a strong positive association between the strength of an authorial voice and the quality of the authors' text, *'results from Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA) pointed to the association of low and mid-level of writing quality and low voice strength, and the prevalence of high and mid voice strength in learners with high proficiency in writing'* (Zabihi et al., 2019, p. 331).

Among the most vivid descriptors to indicate the quality of the author's voice or the writer's presence are: self-identification expressions; intensifiers; selecting and combining the available resources; lexical, syntactic, punctuation features of writing responding to other voices; and autonomy of thought (Zabihi et al., 2019, p. 331).

This paper highlighted that the level of voice strength in L2 argumentative writings among Russian learners of English changes within the course of academic writing practice. Data analysis indicated a significant shift in the voices' strength at the postgraduate level. While calculating academic text authenticity coefficient, it was estimated that Master's students got higher scores than Bachelor's students (Master's students results within the bands from 4 to 11 compared to 1.5 – 3.5 bands for Bachelors). Mostly the raise of text authenticity is in-

dicated through the increase of such text qualities of the Russian students as original ideas, source-based writing, and more active grammar forms through which the authors start expressing personal contribution to the area of their research. These criteria of text authenticity somehow indicate a potential strength of the authorial voice as well as correspond to the descriptors of the author's voice. Consequently, the qualities of authenticity and individuality are merged in academic texts.

To fit into the modern educational context, to look more authentic, L2 writers need additional training. For this reason, a new system of teaching academic writing has been formed. The system aimed at meeting cultural expectations should be characterised by the revised aims, contents of the Academic Writing course, teaching materials, teaching strategies that involve cross-cultural comparison. Additionally, a new process of assessment should be introduced for students to better understand the needs of their potential readers.

A certain limitation to the research results may be found in the target group. Post-graduate students belong to the group of learners who have formed a strong professional motivation. They know that they should follow conventions to be successful in the chosen career and show little or no resistance to the material taught. They easily adapt numerous culture-specific requirements. However, a specific feature of written intercultural communication in the English academic writing classroom with the Russian students is boosting of individualism and authenticity. They adopt a direct approach in conveying information to readers, manifest their unique voices, and choose more language elements to underline personal contribution (choice of pronouns, active constructions, intensifiers). A new adapted style allows the authors – Master's students – to learn to reveal their personal contribution to the research. The practice of intercultural communication, in its turn, reveals that finding one's individual voice meets the potential reader's high expectations in the academic context.

In conclusion, authenticity coupled with individuality pertains greatly to the quality of academic texts. Accepting these conventions, adopting intercultural manner and style of academic writing, students gain an effective strategy and a key to success in the international communication.

References

Bardhan, S. (2016). *Rhetorical approaches to communication and culture*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bieva, E. G. (1982). *Text levels and methods of linguistic analysis*. Moscow, Russia: Nauka.

Brookes, A., & Grundy, P. (1991). *Writing for study purposes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chuikova, E. S. (2017). Introducing cross cultural perspectives into teaching academic writing to Master's students in Russia. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 7*(8), 228-239. Doi: 10.26655/mjltm.2017.8.1

Chuikova, E. S. (2018). Assessing academic texts authenticity in EFL classes. *RUDN Journal of Psychology and Pedagogics*, *15*(4), 500-511. Doi: 10.22363/2313-1683-2018-15-4-500-511

Ciornei, S. I., & Dina, T. A. (2015). Authentic texts in teaching English. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 180,* 274-279. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.116

Connor, U. (2011). *Intercultural rhetoric in the writing classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Ene, E., McIntosh, K., & Connor, U. (2019). Using intercultural rhetoric to examine translingual practices of postgraduate L2 writers of English. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 45,* 100664. Doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100664

Gribanova, T. I., & Gaidukova, T. M. (2019). Hedging in different types of discourse. *Training, Language and Culture, 3*(2), 85-99. Doi: 10.29366/2019tlc.3.2.6

Karaulov, Yu. N. (1989). *Language and personality*. Moscow, Russia: Nauka.

Kharkovskaya, A. A., Ponomarenko, E. V., & Radyuk, A. V. (2017). Minitexts in modern educational discourse: Functions and trends. *Training, Language*

and Culture, *1*(1), 62-76. Doi: 10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.4

Liu, Y., & Du, Q. (2018). Intercultural rhetoric through a learner lens: American students' perceptions of evidence use in Chinese yìlùnwén writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *40,* 1-11. Doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2018.01.001

McGee, P. (2018). Vague language as a means of avoiding controversy. *Training, Language and Culture*, *2*(2), 40-54. Doi: 10.29366/2018tlc.2.2.3

Morton, J., & Storch, N. (2019). Developing an authorial voice in PhD multilingual student writing: The reader's perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *43*, 15-23. Doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2018.02.004

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2019). *The nature and functions of critical and creative thinking*. Washington, DC: Rowman & Littlefield.

Siepmann, D. (2006). Academic writing and culture: An overview of differences between English, French and German. *Translators' Journal*, *51*(1), 131-150. Doi: 10.7202/012998ar

Thompson, L. W., Bagby, J. H., Sulak, T. N., Sheets, J., & Trepinski, T. M. (2017). The cultural elements of academic honesty. *Journal of International Students, 7*(1), 136-153. Doi: 10.32674/jis.v7i1.249

Yarosh, M., Lukic, D., & Santibáñez-Gruber, R. (2018). Intercultural competence for students in international joint master programmes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *66,* 52-72. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.06.003

Yu, S. (2019). Learning from giving peer feedback on postgraduate theses: Voices from Master's students in the Macau EFL context. *Assessing Writing*, *40,* 42-52. Doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2019.03.004

Zabihi, R., Mehrani-Rad, M., & Khodi, A. (2019). Assessment of authorial voice strength in L2 argumentative written task performances: Contributions of voice components to text quality. *Journal of Writing Research, 11*(2), 331-355. Doi: 10.17239/jowr-2019.11.02.04

Zhao, C. G. (2017). Voice in timed L2 argumentative essay writing. *Assessing Writing*, *31,* 73-83. Doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2016.08.004