



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898479*

RFC: ATI120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticayvalores.com/>

ISSN: 2007 – 7890.

Año: III. Número: 2 Artículo no.7 Período: Octubre, 2015-Enero, 2016.

TÍTULO: Interacción de los géneros académicos Ruso e Inglés en el Aprendizaje Integrado Contenido-Lengua de los programas de doctorado de Sociología de la Administración: una brecha en el proceso de implementación.

AUTORES:

1. Dra. Mariia Pavenkova Rubtcova.
2. Dr. Oleg Vladimirovich Pavenkov.

RESUMEN: El documento examina algunos límites de la introducción del Aprendizaje Integrado de Contenido y Lengua basado en el Enfoque Sistémico Funcional Lingüístico en los programas de doctorado sociológicos no occidentales. El autor se centra específicamente en los marcadores pragmáticos como herramientas para la estructuración del discurso escrito de la ciencia con el uso de este enfoque para identificar las diferencias entre los géneros académicos del Ruso y del Inglés. Se recogieron datos de tesis doctorales en Ruso e Inglés desde en el campo de la Sociología de la Administración y se muestra que el número promedio de marcadores pragmáticos es en 1000 palabras-3.81 en tesis doctorales escritas en Ruso y de 2,27 en tesis doctorales escritas en Inglés. El autor sugiere que estas variaciones están asociadas con la estructura y los objetivos de un artículo científico. Géneros académicos del Inglés son más empíricos, mientras que los del Ruso se centran en el desarrollo de la teoría.

PALABRAS CLAVES: los géneros académicos en la Sociología de la Administración, la Lingüística Funcional Sistémica, el Enfoque basado en Género, el Aprendizaje Integrado Contenido-Lengua, la comunicación académica.

TITLE: Interaction of Russian and English academic genres in CLIL doctoral programmes of Management Sociology: a gap in the process of implementation.

AUTHORS:

1. Dra. Mariia Pavenkova Rubtcova.
2. Dr. Oleg Vladimirovich Pavenkov.

ABSTRACT: The paper examines some limits of the introduction of SFL-based CLIL approach in non-western sociological doctoral programmes. The author is focusing specifically on pragmatic markers as tools for the structuring of science written discourse and using this approach to identify the differences between Russian and English academic genres. Data was collected from doctoral theses in Russian and in English from the field of sociology of management. It is shown that the average number of pragmatic markers at 1000 words-3.81 in Russian theses and 2.27 in doctoral theses written in English. The author suggests that these variations are associated with the structure and goals of a scholarly paper. English academic genres are more empirical, whereas Russian focused on the development of theory.

KEY WORDS: academic genres in sociology of management, Systemic functional linguistics (SFL), genre-based approach, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), academic communication.

INTRODUCTION.

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) combines education in professional subjects and language skills. Because «the most suited to providing a framework for the integration of language and content was Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), particularly the constructs of genre and register» (Morton, 2012: 88-89), the implementation process in non-western university contexts could mainly focus on the SFL-based CLIL approach. SFL applications to CLIL have achieved significant success and it is well covered in the literature (see, e.g. Dafouz & Guerrini, 2009; Smit, 2010; Llinares, A., Morton, T., & Whittaker, R. 2012; Fortanet-Gómez, 2013).

The CLIL approach would be useful for the introduction of in Russian universities because it can tell us how to develop academic genres and to generate discussion, focusing not only on the development of scientific knowledge but also on the development of English scientific language (Dafouz, E. 2014). In conditions in which Russian Ph.D. students have a serious concern about the level of their English skills (Proshina, 2006) the SFL-based CLIL concept provides a reliable start for the development of academic skills in English.

According Martin «genre theory is developed as an outline of how we use language to live; it tries to describe the ways in which we mobilize language – how out of all the things we might do with language, each culture chooses just a few, and enacts them over and over again – slowly adding to the repertoire as needs arise, and slowly dropping things that are not much use. Genre theory is thus a theory of the borders of our social world, and our familiarity with what to expect» (Martin, 2009: 13).

If we would like to introduce SFL-based CLIL in Russian universities, the key idea for us is associated with the culture: if each culture chooses just a few ways of working with language, how do we introduce English academic genres teaching our Russian students? In other words,

if we implement the CLIL programme in English, what academic genres should be used: Russian or English? How do we teach students Russian academic genres in English?

DEVELOPMENT.

SFL-pedagogy has not seriously thought about this issue. For example, Martin and Rose (2007) recommend the implementation of the genre-based SFL concept in China, but we cannot find the authors' concerns that Chinese and English academic language are different. Martin and Rose paper itself gives the impression of attempting to offer the Western concept for a non-Western country without a serious analysis of the consequences of such a decision.

Perhaps the lack of such a concern is due to the history of the SFL conception. At the beginning, the SFL conception worked with English as a native language (Bernstein & Henderson, 1969; Bernstein, 1970). This first context - English for native speakers from poorer classes - has no direct relationship to CLIL, although the original ideas that were developed by SFL to enhance academic genres to mitigate social inequality may have an attractive force for CLIL promotion. Then, the context of non-English speakers in English-speaking countries has been a major focus of attention in SFL and education. An example of this is Martin and Rose's work with migrants in Australia (e.g. Martin & Rose, 2007). Now, we are talking about the context of non-native English language development in a non-English environment and about many World Englishes (e.g. Halliday, 2003). Thus, the problem of English academic genre promotion in non-western countries did not appear originally, but now SFL faces a new context of globalization and prompt distribution of English outside the English-speaking Western world.

The founder of SFL, Michael Halliday, has recently tried to address this challenge in an article about World Englishes, where he urged non-English-speaking countries to promote the national variants of English, which could develop a national mentality and culture (Halliday, 2003).

However, it is a rather complex challenge. Only a few Russian researchers have begun to develop the Russian English, especially for Russian universities (e.g. Proshina, 2006, 2014).

In the current study, we focused on some genre aspects of CLIL implementation in Sociology of Management Doctoral programmes. In preliminary studies on the implementation of CLIL programmes in the field of social sciences, we faced serious resistance from professors (Rubtcova, 2015a). They noted numerous dilemmas, including the belief that students won't be ready to use Russian fundamental science in English, and concepts in English without in deep analysis will be understood in the primitive way (Rubtcova, 2015a).

With the purpose of addressing these concerns, we can compare the Russian and English academic genres. The introduction of pedagogical innovations may essentially depend on the sustainable models of the conduct of the scientific communities (Volchkova & Pavenkova, 2002; Martianova, 2013; Rubtsova, 2007, 2011). These models are closely connected with culture and traditions (Parsons, 1952), culture and traditions can have an important impact on the genre, adopted in a given society (Luckmann, 2009; Rubtsova & Sanina, 2012).

In fact, Kogut (2014) and Proshina (2006, 2014) show that the Russian academic genres, both written and oral, are considerably different from the English. Russian academic writing involves writing a semi-structured text, which often does not have separate parts (in articles) or has a minimum amount of parts (in theses). The task of clarifying the order of ideas is performed through pragmatic markers (Kogut, 2014). S. Kogut has compared Russian and German articles and found that the number of markers in the Russian articles is much higher than the number of markers in the German articles: 112 and 45, respectively (Kogut, 2014: 22-23). All German-language articles are clearly structured in sections, and each of the sections has a corresponding title: introduction, chapters, subchapters and conclusion. Most of the Russian authors emphasize the forced transition from one scene to another and the end of

argumentation using markers: «therefore», «it can be concluded», «as a result», «thus», «consequently» (Kogut, 2014: 24).

In order to check differences between Russian and English academic genres, we are focusing specifically on pragmatic markers as tools for the structuring of science written discourse (Kogut, 2014: 18). Therefore, our study addressed the following research question:

- Are there differences in the use of pragmatic markers in Russian and English Doctoral Theses?

Data and Methodology.

Data was collected from six Doctoral Theses – three in Russian and three in English – from the field of Sociology of Management (see Appendix 1). For the selection of the theses, we asked three independent experts who teach at a bilingual programme at the St. Petersburg University. They informed us about the theses that they use most often and we studied these theses.

We have chosen the Russian theses of «doktornauk» (a post-doctoral degree called Doctor of Sciences, which is given to reflect second (advanced) research qualifications or higher doctorates in ISCED 2011) due to the fact that, in accordance with the formal requirements of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation (VAK, 2015), this scientific genre is more clearly structured, whereas Russian articles usually do not meet this requirement (see e.g. Rubtsova, 2009). Therefore, one might expect that Russian scientists are using pragmatic markers in the Russian theses of «doktornauk» similarly to the way these are used in theses in English. In order to do our study comparable to the other, we also like Kogut chose pragmatic markers «therefore», «it can be concluded», «as a result», «thus», «consequently» (see: Kogut, 2014: 24).

Results.

The table 1 is presented the results. As we can see the average number of markers per 1000 words is 3,81 in Russian theses and 2,27 in theses in English. These results are similar to those obtained by Kogut (Kogut, 2014).

Table 1. Pragmatic markers in Russian and English doctoral theses.

	Russian-language theses.			English-language theses.		
	Doctoral Thesis 1	Doctoral Thesis 2	Doctoral Thesis 3	Doctoral Thesis 1	Doctoral Thesis 2	Doctoral Thesis 3
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Total words	79311 words	63105 words	81290 Words	50076 words	29337 words	55954 Words
Pragmatic markers: «therefore», «so» / «поэтому», «потому»	«поэтому» - 45 «потому» - 32	«поэтому» - 117 «потому» - 3	«поэтому» - 107 «потому»- 6	«therefore» - 4 «so» -79	«therefore» - 23 «so» -8	«therefore» - 8 «so» -3
Pragmatic markers: «consequently», «hence» / «следовательно»	Следовательно -16	Следовательно -21	Следовательно -30	Consequently-0 Hence -0	Consequently-0 Hence -0	Consequently-14 hence - 0
Pragmatic markers «as a result», «to sum up», «summarize» / «врезультате», «витоге»	в результате -81 в итоге - 2	в результате -21 в итоге -4	в результате -37 в итоге 3	as a result – 0 In sum, to sum up -0 To summarize- 0 Finally-4	as a result- 1 In sum, to sum up -0 To summarize- 0 Finally-16	as a result -1 In sum, to sum up – 0 To summarize-0 Finally-5
Pragmatic markers it could be said, it could be concluded /	можно заключить -0 можно сказать -3	можно заключить -1 можно сказать -14	можно заключить -5 можно сказать -3	it could/may be concluded, let us	it could/may be concluded, let us	it could/may be concluded, let us conclude, to

«МОЖНОЗАКЛЮЧИТЬ», «МОЖНОСКАЗАТЬ»				conclude, to conclude -1 it could be said -0	conclude, to conclude -0 it could be said -0	conclude -0 it could be said -0
Pragmatic markersMake/d raw conclusion / «МОЖНОсделать ВЫВОД	Можно сделать вывод - 12	Можно сделать вывод - 10	Можно сделать вывод - 14	Make/draw conclusion -0	Make/draw conclusion -0	Make/draw conclusion -0
Pragmatic markers«thus» / «ТАКИМобразом »	Таким образом - 98	Таким образом - 102	Таким образом - 50	Thus - 4	Thus - 16	Thus - 125
Total	289	293	255	92	64	156
Number of markers on 1000 words.	3,64	4,64	3,14	1,83	2,18	2,79
The average number of markers on 1000 words.	3,81			2,27		

What are the reasons for this seemingly excessive use of pragmatic markers in well-structured Russian academic papers? According to S. Kogut, this difference is caused by the fact that the Russian academic language is semi-structured (Kogut, 2014). In this regards, it is necessary to compare typical schemes (model) of Russian and English scientific paper.

The approximate scheme of a typical Russian Doctoral Theses in the field of social science is the following (Kuzin, 2014):

1. The problem, which is dedicated to the study, is presented in two parts: the theoretical part (how to describe this phenomenon) and the empirical part (how to change a situation).
2. The theoretical-methodological base: works of classics in the field, including basic philosophical conceptions, for example, Hegel's dialectics of development.

3. Possibilities and limits of the theoretical-methodological basis and its key opponents, according to Karl Popper's falsification criterion (see Popper, 2004).

4. Empirical verification of the theoretical-methodological basis (empirical research).

5. Two groups of conclusions: conclusions about the applicability of this theoretical and methodological basis in examining the problem and recommendations for solving a problem.

In a brief scheme, a Russian Doctoral Theses can be represented as theory –practice - theory.

The approximate scheme (model) of a typical English academic article in the field of social science is the following (Whittaker, 2014):

1. Problem, which research is devoted to (Introduction).

2. Research questions and hypotheses.

3. Theoretical Framework (recent articles in this field).

4. Data and methodology.

5. Opportunities and limits of the empirical methodology.

6. Results.

7. Discussion: paper's contribution to the solution of an empirical problem in contexts of other similar studies.

In a brief scheme, an English academic paper can be represented as practice –theory - practice.

Perhaps this difference creates a peculiar perception of Russian professors. In their interviews, they said that ‘the English academic genre is empirical, whereas the Russian is rationalistic’ (Rubtcova, M. 2015b). For many Russian scientists in the field of social sciences, this difference is essential, and they have a critical attitude towards ‘the domination of empiricism in Western science’ (Rubtcova, M. 2015b). Switching to work with English academic genres can be perceived as ‘a crisis of scientific knowledge under the Western influence’,

‘deterioration or elimination of a philosophical basis’, ‘refusal to check theoretical limits and lack of serious work with the opponents’ points of view’ (Rubtcova, M. 2015a).

CONCLUSIONS.

Discussion.

Our research helps clarify some reasons why Russian social science professors can avoid the transition to English as the language of doctoral teaching and scientific communications. The scientific community, in accordance with the characteristics of the professional communities, has its own values and traditions. The transition to English language teaching cannot lead to the mechanical replacement of one language to another; this transition involves the use of English academic genres including the introduction of the Western structure of the article and the changes in the writing of final papers.

Due to the fact that the genre-based CLIL focuses on academic English, it assumes development of English academic genres, including the western traditions of academic writing. The difference in English and Russian academic genres could become one of the obstacles in the implementation of CLIL Doctoral programmes. That is why the key question of CLIL introduction in the Russian academic environment is the following: which model of academic genres will be taught in the English language: Russian or English? Perhaps, we have to find a combination of these genres in our CLIL Doctoral programmes. When we introduce new CLIL Doctoral programmes at Russian universities, we should take into account these differences.

Limitation of the study.

While the small-scale investigation has been confirmed as a suitable procedure for directing our research questions, a number of shortcomings of this approach need to be recognized. The selection of small-scale research indicates that the consequences cannot be considered to be representative. Hence, the small sample size allows us to make only preliminary conclusions. In

conjunction with the lack of information on this topic in Russia and reflecting the glut of ideological narratives, these conclusions can be useful. Notwithstanding some Russian ideological beliefs and comprehension of the English language as a tool of latent control, these conclusions show that there are possibilities to open debate about genre differences in sociological academic English and Russian.

Suggestions for further research.

A study on the interaction between Russian and English academic genres in Sociology should be continued. We still do not know how to work with the English academic language and, at the same time to keep Russian scientific traditions that deserve careful care of their development. Perhaps it makes sense to think of the development of Russian English as part of World Englishes. It can be an objective of the further research.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests.

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding.

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES:

1. Bernstein, B. 1970. A socio-linguistic approach to socialisation: with some references to educability. Directions in Sociolinguistics (eds.) Gumperz, J. and Hymes, D., Holt ,Rinehart and Winston, New York.
2. Bernstein, B. and Henderson, D. 1969. Social class differences in the relevance of language to socialisation. *Sociology*, 3(1):1-20 doi: 10.1177/003803856900300101.

3. Bernstein, B.B. 1999. Vertical and horizontal discourse: an essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20, 157–173(17).
4. Dafouz E. &Guerrini M. C. (eds). 2009. *CLIL across Educational Levels*. Madrid: Santillana Educación / Richmond Publishing, 2009. 148 pages. ISBN: 978-84-668-0259-8.
5. Dafouz, E. 2014. Integrating content and language in European higher education: An overview of recurrent research concerns and pending issues. In Psaltou-Joycey, E. Agathopoulou and M. Mattheoudakis (eds) *Cross-Curricular Approaches to Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars. Pp. 289-304.
6. Fortanet-Gómez's I. 2013. *CLIL in Higher Education. Towards a Multilingual Language Policy*. Multilingual Matters: Bristol.
7. Halliday, M.A.K. 2003. Written language, standard language, global language. *World Englishes*, 22(4): 405-418.
8. ISCED, 2011. The official website of the International Standard Classification of Education. URL: <http://www.uis.unesco.org/education/documents/isced-2011-en.pdf> (01/09/2015)
9. Kuzin F., 2014. PhD thesis. The technique of writing. [In Russian]. Moscow: Os.
10. Kogut S., 2014. Discourse markers in Russian and German geological scientific papers. [In Russian]. *Tomsk State University Journal*. Tomsk. No. 380: 18-23.
11. Llinares, A., Morton, T., and Whittaker, R., 2012. *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Luckmann, Th. 2009. Observations on the structure and function of communicative genres, *Semiotics*, 173 (1-4).
13. Martyanova, N.A. 2013. *Construction of Professional Associations: from professional groups to expert communities*. *Izvestiya Rossiiskogogosudarstvennogopedagogicheskogouniversitetaim*. A.I. Gertsena. 162, 136-140.

14. Martin, J.R. & D. Rose 2007. Interacting with text: the role of dialogue in learning to read and write. *Foreign Language Studies Journal*, Beijing.
15. Martin, J.R. 2009. Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 20 (1):10-21. doi: 10.1016/j.linged.2009.01.003.
16. Morton, T. 2012. Teachers' Knowledge About Language and Classroom Interaction in Content and Language Integrated Learning. Unpublished PhD thesis. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
17. Parsons T. 1952. *Social System*. Routledge.
18. Popper K. R., 2004. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. [In Russian] Moscow: Republic
19. Proshina Z.G., 2006. Russia English: status, attitudes, problems the journal of Asia TEFL (3)2: 79-101.
20. Proshina Z.G., 2014. Russian English: Myth or Reality? *Intercultural Communication Studies XXIII*:1.
21. Rubtcova, M. 2015a. The professional bilingualism, English and Russian, in the teaching of social sciences. 9th LKPA and the 3rd VMU IFL International Scientific Conference. Sustainable Multilingualism: Language, Culture and Society. Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas 29-30th May, 2015.
22. Rubtcova, M. 2015b. Innovative Teaching Strategies in Public Administration: Bilingual Education. TPAC 2015. Achieving Impact through Teaching: Strategies, Metrics, and Milestones. Teaching Public Administration Conference. Franklin University. Columbus, Ohio, USA. June 3-5, 2015.
23. Rubtsova, M. V. 2007. Manageability: Sociological theoretical analysis of notions. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 12, 32-38.

24. Rubtsova, M. V. 2009. Manageability as a fundamental category of sociology of management. Tomsk State University Journal. 320, 53-57.
25. Rubtsova, M. V. 2011. Governmentability in interactions of subjects. Traditional and new practices. Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya, 2, 46-53
26. Rubtsova, M. & Sanina A. 2012. National Identity as a Factor of Control of Modern Society. The Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology. XV. 3, 86-97.
27. Smit, U. 2010. English as a Lingua Franca in Higher Education. A Longitudinal Study of Classroom Discourse. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
28. VAK, 2015. Official website of Higher Attestation Commission of the Ministry of Education and Science [in Russian] URL: <http://vak.ed.gov.ru/> (01/09/2015)
29. Volchkova, L. T., & Pavenkova, M. V. 2002 Sociology of management. Theoretical principles. Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya, 3, 141-144
30. Whittaker, R. 2014 Research methods in linguistics. Presentation of the course. UAM, Madrid.

List of sources.

Russian-language theses:

1. Kuznecova S.I. (2010) Konceptual'nye osnovaniya issledovaniya fenomena upravljajemosti v sociologii upravlenija. Dissertacija ... doktor sociologicheskikh nauk: 22.00.08. Na pravah rukopisi. Sankt-Peterburg State University.
2. Minina V.N. (1999) Metodologija social'nogo programmirovaniya. Dissertacija ... doktor sociologicheskikh nauk: 22.00.08. Na pravah rukopisi. Sankt-Peterburg State University.
3. Vasil'eva E. A. (2015) Transformacija Gosudarstvennoj Sluzhby V Uslovijah Social'nogo Gosudarstva: Sociologicheskij Analiz. Dissertacija ... doktor sociologicheskikh nauk: 22.00.08. Na pravah rukopisi. Sankt-Peterburg State University.

English-language theses:

1. Boyer M. D. (2009) Organizational improvisation within an episodic planning model: a systems perspective. Unpublished PhD thesis. Capella University.
2. Kimberling L. S. (2008) Ethical reasoning and transformational leadership: an investigation of public sector leaders. Unpublished PhD thesis. Capella University.
3. Rennaker M. A. (2008) Listening and Persuasion: Examining the Communicative Patterns of Servant Leadership. Unpublished PhD thesis. Regent University.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Mariia Pavenkova Rubtcova is Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at the Saint Petersburg State University, Russia. She got her Candidate (PhD) Degree in Sociology of Management in St.-Petersburg State University in 2001, and Doctoral Degree in 2011 in Herzen State Pedagogical University. Her main research area is an interdisciplinary approach to manageability. She is the author of *Sociological Theory of Manageability* (Book house, 2010) in addition to approximately 50 papers and articles in the field of social sciences. As CLIL/EMI Content Professor, she is also interested in SFL-based CLIL as a theoretically grounded framework and a pedagogic approach that has developed in response to the demand for integrating education in both university subjects and language skills. Current works are devoted to the CLIL/EMI/ESP/EAP implementation in Russian universities.

2. Oleg Vladimirovich Pavenkov is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Media communication at the Saint Petersburg Institute of Film and Television, Russia. He got his Candidate (PhD) Degree in Philosophy in Leningrad State University, Russia, in 2010. His research focuses on identity. He is the author of series of books on evolution of a concept of love, such as *The Evolution of the Concept of Love in Philosophical Anthropology: From Eastern Patristics to Russian Religious Philosophy* (SPbGiT, 2014) and *The Evolution of the*

Concept of Love in Latin Patristics IV-V Centuries (SPbGiT, in press). He is also interested in visual sociology and cognitive linguistics. He has attended several international conferences and has published in journals such as Herald of the Russian Christian Academy for Humanities and Studia Humanitatis. Current works are devoted to the CLIL implementation in Philosophy teaching.

RECIBIDO: 10 de diciembre del 2015.

APROBADO: 21 de diciembre del 2015.