

Using a Literacy Tutor's Reflexive Journaling for Addressing L1 Literacy Gaps in a Central Asian EMI University

Konstantinos Kristofer Dimitriou
KIMEP University, Kazakhstan

Darina Omurzakova
KIMEP University, Kazakhstan

Abstract

Literacy support in an EMI university in Central Asia (CA) helps students with the challenging linguistic demands of tertiary study in a second (foreign) language (L2). As Kazakhstan's post-Soviet education system (Yassukova, 2020) lacks significant first-language (L1) reading-to-write education (Keck, 2014; Friedman, 2019), English L2-literacy development has become even more difficult when compared to other regions of the world. Students' literacy capabilities need to be investigated by L2-literacy tutors in order to scaffold learning better. Questions emerge as to whether it would help that the tutor had developed her L1 literacy through the same (but chronologically-earlier) system. To unpack this question, research can draw on perspectives in language socialisation (LS) (Duff, 2012), which sees learning environments as dynamic socially/culturally situated processes. To this end, this study looks at one L2-English literacy tutor's (author 2) experiences in a tertiary Foundation writing course. The goal was to see how the tutor's interpretations of classroom literacy problems could inform the teaching of low L1-literacy students' writing and metalanguage. For this purpose, we studied the reflective journaling (Burton, 2005) of the tutor who wrote reflective journals during a semester-long course in early 2020. The findings indicate that reflexivity can help a tutor find solutions, and that a similarity of background seems to help a local literacy tutor understand, and respond to, many of their students' needs.

Introduction

The teaching of English literacy within an English-as-a-medium-of-Instruction (EMI) university in Central Asia (CA) is a relatively understudied subject (see Goodman & Montgomery, 2020) because of the political and educational history of the region. Though EMI in Central Asia is far from unique (e.g., China), there are certain aspects of CA students' L1 literacy which make teaching literacy a particular challenge. This makes it worth studying the language socialisation (LS) process of such EMI students. LS is a neo-Vygotskian social-constructivist qualitative methodology (Duff, 2010) that examines the dynamics of socially-situated processes of identity transformation in educational interaction as seen through learning activities.

LS recognises the effect of the macro scale of education (country/Ministry level, cultural context) on classroom learning situations. English is a particularly-prized foreign language in Kazakhstan, for purposes of internationalisation (Parmenter et al., 2017 in Goodman & Montgomery, 2020) and the official trilingual-education policy (Kazakh, Russian, English) (Nazarbayev, 2007 in Goodman & Montgomery, 2020). Typically, L2-English students have a much smaller English vocabulary than native speakers and less experience of English literacy (Roessingh, 2006). Further to that, L2-English students' knowledge and capabilities are mostly built upon the foundations of their L1 education, including cognition (Sharp, 2010), rather than their proficiency in English. Thus, competencies gained in the L1 can support development in

the L2. However, the L1 literacy schooling in Kazakhstan is quite weak (Goodman & Montgomery, 2020), making it challenging for students to develop their L2-English competencies. While this may seem a barrier to accessing higher education through English, it may not be, since the university entry tests (e.g., IELTS) do not reflect the difficult requirements of tertiary writing (Neff, 2013). Therefore, students with weak literacy skills can still gain entry, and yet struggle to acquire L2-English tertiary literacy, sometimes leading to withdrawal (Ashton-Hay & Doncaster, 2021).

Therefore, to improve their chances, such student could be taught English tertiary literacy and study skills in a scaffolded manner by a tutor who understands these weak L1 foundations. The literacy tutor¹ must be able to recognise particular shortcomings, during the teaching sessions, diagnose the reasons for these shortcomings, and provide appropriate lessons to support development. This means that a tutor's sensitivity to such issues is of great importance. If the tutor is of a similar background to the students (L1 & education), while having been inducted into Anglophone tertiary culture, this might help them in recognising students' difficulties.

In order for such difficulties to be recognised and examined, a tutor would be aided by reflection on classroom activity and use those to find solutions. Journaling has been used by tutors widely in professional development work such as Action Research (Burns, 2003). However, no such research has looked at EMI tertiary literacy in Kazakhstan. This paper investigates how a local, L2-English tutor (author 2) used journaling to understand and address particular classroom literacy problems and shows how she used her own L2-English acquisition experience to provide some of those solutions.

Language socialisation theory & education in Kazakhstan

Language socialisation has its basis in linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, and education theory, and investigates culturally- and socially-situated literacy work (Duff, 2010, 2012). It looks at the setting, the context and interaction, in all of its modes. It has been used in various educational contexts to qualitatively look at processes of personal transformation (teachers & students) and “the cultural significance of particular linguistic and activity structures” (Duff, 2007, p. 313). With the focus on classroom activities and processes, LS differs from much Academic Literacies research as it largely focuses on institution-teacher-student power dynamics (Lillis, 2001; Wingate & Tribble, 2012).

The macro level context of a country is important for understanding education therein because of the role of relevant government structures (e.g., the Ministry for Education/school system) and the cultural context on the classroom. Each Kazakhstani public school uses one legal language (either Kazakh or Russian) for the 12 years of mandatory schooling. Kazakhstan, as a relatively young country, seems to have the remnants of its prior, Soviet educational history (e.g., teaching/testing discreet facts). Its culture also reflects a preference for authoritarian upbringing of children, collectivist thinking and large power distance (Hofstede, 2011). Opinions are predetermined by the group elders, and they teach obedience to children, who, in turn, expect to be told what to do.

Post-Soviet curricula also de-emphasise literacy such that academic types of thinking, like the ability to logically systematise information, or plan writing (Tarnopolsky, 2004; Yassukova, 2020) are ignored. Recognising this, the OECD (2018) finds Kazakhstani education to be excessively theoretical, wide and superficial, as it does not engage students in the practical development of skills and competencies. A direct result of this approach to literacy is that literacy outcomes in reading are relatively poor (PISA test, 2009 to 2012- OECD, 2018). Though Ministry guidelines (NAO, 2015 a, b) for curricula indicate literacy activities like writing different types of texts (e.g., essays), synthesizing information from texts, and analysing and evaluating information should form a part of national education, very large classes (30+ pupils) are the norm, making the teaching of literacy logistically difficult (e.g., lack of teacher training,

¹At KIMEP University, we use 'tutor' to mean a classroom-based educator for adult students (as opposed to a school teacher)

idiosyncratic marking). Therefore, assessment consists mostly of checking the accuracy of discreet facts (Goodman & Montgomery, 2020), requiring mostly memorising (Soltys, 2020).

The cultural norms regarding literacy, also carried over from the Soviet era, can affect education. Many post-Soviet tutors may support the idea that writing is a dangerous act (Yakontova, 2001) which could transgress norms. Hence, there is little creative expression and behaviour outside of the norm is discouraged. Matriculation at the age of 17 also limits the degree to which students can learn to write (Soltys, 2020). In fact, our previous study found that students' high school literacy activity lacked depth (e.g., no critical reading). These issues add to the L1-literacy deficiency of high school graduates. For such graduates, entry into an advanced tertiary discourse community (Duff, 2012), and its largely tacit (foreign) culture of scholarship (Macbeth, 2006) would seem very challenging, were it not for literacy tutors.

A literacy tutor is 'positioned' at a Liberal Arts university in Central Asia, an EMI institution, to represent its goals by virtue of the work that they do. According to LS (Duff, 2016), the main role of the tutor is to socialise students into the academic culture, rather than simply delivering content. The cultural (literacy) expectations require particular study skills (e.g., argumentation, supporting evidence, drawing conclusions). The tools for this include the course syllabus, the teaching environment (like classroom discourse), and materials/assessment. Within those parameters, the tutor is the socialising agent, or mentor (Duff & Anderson, 2015) i.e., someone of greater knowledge who assists others in learning.

However, a tutor is a person with their own agency, as they make agentive choices and negotiate their identity while interacting with the students. Each tutor develops their professional identity through education, and teaching experience. The tutor's identity affects their beliefs and how they act in the classroom, in a kind of iterative process (Duff, 2016). This dynamic teaching process also allows for the tutor to grow as a professional.

Tertiary literacy socialisation of Central Asia EMI undergraduates

The L1 cognitive work in high school should develop students' capabilities with abstract topics and the use of abstract terms (Roessingh, 2006), to allow them to handle complex university subjects. Success at university literacy also requires good study habits, like in-depth reading and related writing activities (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008), like source use (Sharp, 2010; Keck, 2014) and citation (Friedman, 2019). It is unfortunate that some school systems do not provide such literacy opportunities (Hirvela & Du, 2013), such as in most post-Soviet countries.

An implicit aspect of literacy teaching is literacy metacognition about writing (Negretti, 2012). If students can label and describe aspects of their own writing (e.g., evidence, argument), they can more easily be taught to understand how to write (Wei & Zhang, 2020), and do so independently (Anderson, 2007). However, if students have not had such teaching or experience in their L1 schooling, as is often the case in Kazakhstan, then the lack of a metacognitive framework could further complicate L2-literacy acquisition. This may mean not only a deficit of academic language, but also a deficit of critical thinking, literacy structure and metalanguage (Hirvela, 2017: 72). Owing to such linguistic, cultural and pedagogical gaps, CA L2-English students' literacy needs are different from those of L1-English students (Hirvela, 2017).

A good tutor needs to make the relevant tertiary language and culture gaps explicit to students through teaching (Duff, 2010). Therefore, when teaching reading-to-write literacy, the tutor must scaffold the teaching to fit students' actual needs (Huang 2004 in Goodman & Montgomery, 2020). The students have a degree of agency, because their acts of cooperation or failures tell the tutor who they are and what they are going through in the learning process. This can also place expectations on the tutor (Duff, 2016) to respond to unexpected needs. This challenge requires a tutor who, through education and/or experience, can recognise students' capabilities and react accordingly.

A local, L2-English tutor (like Author 2) from the same country could, and often is, chosen to teach Foundation² students using her L2 (English). A local tutor could have had a similar L1 educational experience to that of her students, and yet have some experience of a relevant Anglophone tertiary education system. She would have been through many of the education and cultural experiences that she wishes to guide her students through. Therefore, this tutor might then have a clearer idea of the socialisation process, and how to use social interactions in the classroom to that end (Duff, 2010). Despite such insight, L2-literacy teaching can be a particularly difficult challenge. In light of this difficult task, we need to understand more about a tutor's role in students' tertiary literacy socialisation process. However, no such work has been done before in Kazakhstan.

In this study, our understanding of tertiary literacy socialization was aided by the tutor's first-person recollections of particular experiences. The central focus will be on how the tutor used a journal to recognise, and react to particular learning problems in a Kazakhstan EMI literacy classroom.

The main research question (and sub-ordinate question) is:

1. How can a tutor's personal journal help her understand and address her students' particular literacy socialisation processes in a Kazakhstani English tertiary Foundation writing class?
2. How can a non-native speaker tutor's own English literacy experience aid her in helping her own tertiary literacy students?

The aim of our exploratory study is to define, explain and critically examine aspects of the language socialisation process of Foundation students, which were reflected in the tutor's journal, written during a semester-long course. These data are examined through the lens of language socialisation. This research has the potential to add to our knowledge about how the effects of low L1-literacy in CA EMI Foundation students is recognised and positively addressed.

Method and motivation

Our previous research study³ had brought about a discussion of author 2's journal, which had been being concurrently written (personal initiative), in order to improve her teaching. This self-directed journal was the source of data for the present study. Journaling is a technique which is well-known within Action Research as a reflexive type of writing that is common in teacher professional development. The incidents within are classed under exploring, identifying, analysing/reflecting and intervening (Burns, 2003).

For an exploratory qualitative study into a Foundation English class, journaling is appropriate for various reasons. Firstly, within LS, it is implied that teaching and learning are best viewed as dynamic, concurrent processes of transformation. The participants are agentive actors with their own goals and identity, working together. Therefore, as learning problems arise, there needs to be a method of concurrently recording such events. Secondly, journaling provides a written memory aid to prompt a solution. Thirdly, these data provide an emic perspective from a local tutor (Duff, 2007), showing her proximity to her students and their experience. Fourthly, "first-person narratives and life histories can [...] provide compelling introspective accounts of tutors' experiences over time" (Duff, 2016, p. 174).

Journal entries were made by the tutor in a paper format, on an irregular basis, outside of class time, as issues arose. To focus the reflections, she used her own proforma (Burns, 2003) where she could list events and then reflect on them systematically, which made it more like a log-type format (Wallace, 2005).

2 Pre-undergraduate stage that some entrants are put through, according to their entry-test score.

3 See Dimitriou, Omurzakova & Narymbetova (2020). Bias in the data was detected since the more successful students tended to participate.

Participant & setting

Our subject was the literacy tutor of a Foundation class (author 2), who was a female in her 40s. She had been schooled in the Kazakhstani (Russian-language) system, with L1 literacy activity limited to narrative compositions. This was followed by a bilingual (Russian, English) Bachelor's degree, and a Master's degree in the Teaching of English (studied in English), in Kazakhstan. As a part of her foreign-language degree, the tutor also learned about Anglophone tertiary educational culture, study skills and literacy. As regards teaching, she previously had 18 years of experience, including three years of Foundation teaching.

The program and relevant course materials provided no advice on how to teach, so she was learning through experience, using the syllabus, the main course book, and her own supplementary materials and teaching instincts, as indications of her agency. Her self-declared identity was as a "problem-solver" (Duff, 2007, p. 313) who wanted to help her students think and write independently, within university norms.

Her 20 L2-English students (about 90% Kazakhstanis) were in their second semester, at their second different Foundation level, at our university. Their ages at the beginning of the data collection ranged from 17 to 21. This investigation occurred during the first five months of 2020. The class met daily (weekdays), over the length of one semester (16 weeks). During this data collection phase, a quarantine rule was imposed on the university, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, meaning that classes were transferred to the online mode (Zoom & Moodle VLE).

Qualitative analysis

The journal was analysed with the assistance of author 1 in the interest of critically examining the learning events, while still intending to give a voice to the tutor's ideas (Burton, 2005). Entries were coded (see Appendix 1 for heuristic table) for the literacy topic, and also coded for similarity of experience (tutor & students). Next, coding was added for analyses or solutions and lastly, there are entries regarding any critical meta-analysis. The tutor's observations and teaching solutions were not judged as to their quality, or validity as that is outside of our set goals. However, comparisons with the relevant literature are made, where appropriate.

Results

This report attempts to be chronological, but this is not always possible when discussing activities that have a long duration, complex implications, or overlap in historical time, or when journal entries might not follow the order of events. Each of the following journal extracts (*in italics*) is derived from one or more journal entries and is classed according to a topic area.

Classroom cooperation

As the classroom working relationship developed between the tutor and her students, the tutor often wanted to direct students, in her role as mentor. *"I keep telling them about my experiences as a student and try to show the connection between their writings in the FA and in the future studies."* Though a tutor showing and directing could be seen as domineering, the tutor was in fact inculcating student agency, and the habits of successful writing. Student independence is a universal expectation in Anglophone tertiary education (Skyrme & McGee, 2016), while the students' previous lack of independence was a result of low expectations in L1 schools, with writing tasks that required little independent work.

There were other students who more regularly refused to follow instructions or to submit tasks. *"Some look bored and are reluctant to participate. They miss classes, hardly ever do home assignments. Generally, have quite relaxed attitude."* These students seemed lazy to the tutor. Alternatively, perhaps these students did not understand the lessons or their benefits, or (felt that they) could not communicate their needs to their tutor. *"Most of the students have no idea what the Foundation is for."* However, upon concluding the FA course, most students came to the realisation of the general benefits of the course.

The mandated instructional materials for the FA course were very important for literacy acquisition, but not necessarily for independence. This is why the tutor decided to use peer dialogue for students to help each other through activities. The claimed benefit was that students would develop their own understandings, and therefore have more confidence and independence of thought and action.

Therefore, early on in the course, the tutor noted that students had difficulty building efficient study routines independent of her, like automatic routines (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008). The reason for this was, as most students admitted, that their L1 experience of literacy had embedded no relevant writing or study skills routines as a default. *"Eureka moments, 'ah, we need to use structure'?"* However, by the second half of the semester, the tutor noted that most of the students suddenly started to write more independently. This indicates that the students were becoming more agentive as a result of their lessons.

Reading

The students' reading skills seemed to indicate that the problems of literacy production were based on the lack of metalinguistic knowledge, seen by the tutor during reading exercises. Though most students were aware of the most basic structures of an essay (e.g., introduction), many students were learning about some other elements (e.g., thesis) for the first time. As a result, the tutor noted that the students would need to learn these reading and labelling skills before learning the structure of an opinion paragraph, for the purpose of writing.

The reading difficulties continued with the analysis of reading texts. More specifically, students had substantial difficulty in defining the main idea in a paragraph (metalanguage) and differentiating the details that refer to, or support it. These two elements, according to the journal, required the use of many reading texts and lessons to help students in finding structural elements, thereby helping them to learn the metalanguage also. The source of the difficulty in this area seems to have been a lack of analytical reading in the students' L1. Some difficulty could equally arise from students needing to learn these concepts in their L2.

The students' inability to distinguish the factual value of items they had read was also noted. *"After the explanation and exercise, all who were attentive are able to point at the opinion vs fact on paper. But many of them still had difficulty in their use."* In general, the majority of students could not initially distinguish between fact and opinion (i.e., metalanguage) when they started the semester. Because of their lack of L1 training in this element, and having to learn in an L2, it sometimes required a long learning process, even weeks of study, involving recognising arguments in readings.

Reading-to-write

When the class started reading for the purpose of writing, the tutor's journal noted that the analysis of source texts was an unknown item for her students, as it had been in the tutor's experience of Kazakhstani high school. As a result, she also thought that the students did not know how to find, cite or paraphrase a source text effectively. It is recognised that reading comprehension is a distinct skill from reading-to-write (Delaney, 2008) which is about communicating ideas. Since the teaching of reading to write is not practiced in Kazakh- and Russian- language universities in Kazakhstan to this day, these skills could be considered L2-English tertiary skills.

Writing

As the class started writing, the tutor's journal revealed many students could not understand the various writing tasks. *"Almost all students say that the task is 'why we need advertising' but the task had 2 sides."* The students, when they tried to write the task tended not to fulfil many important parts of the instructions. For example, students tended to focus on one word in the task (e.g., advertising), and ignored other aspects. *"They try to follow, but lack experience with writing."* The tutor saw the reason as being a lack of experience of critical thinking, or writing essays. This second point indicates that cognitive load may have therefore been an issue. Students have limitations on how many instructions they can follow at one time, during a writing process (Macbeth, 2006), perhaps being pre-occupied with the difficulties of L2 writing. The tutor also recorded that she had gone through a similar stage in her development, but without

literacy support. In turn, her solution for her students was a dialogic process of peer work. She used task analysis exercises where students helped each other understand what a task was asking them to do. That allowed for students to develop a dialogue on the issue and verify understanding.

The tutor also instituted essay brainstorming sessions as a preparatory stage for writing, because she realised, from her own experience, the difficulty students had in writing in an organised manner. However, students seemed not to engage with this deeply, *“Brainstorming is not done, unless I insist on a submitted doc.” “I gather ideas from brainstorm and tell sts to use them. Most do not.”* This seems to be one of the few instances of students’ refusal to engage with class activities and the reasons for this refusal never emerged.

Though students had learned about the structure of the academic English text when reading, it was noted they had difficulty structuring their writing, both at the paragraph and essay level. Though students knew the basics of introductions and conclusions well at the beginning, they had difficulty restructuring them to allow for argumentation essays. Firstly, the introduction of an academic essay requires contextualisation of the topic. Even though the essay topics covered were fairly well-known (e.g., animal research), students had difficulty in describing the topic’s context, *“Hardly anyone is able at this point, maybe due to their lack of reading or short life experience.”* The journal indicates that the tutor saw a lack of L1 reading experience at school or a lack of worldly knowledge in her students. However, it could be that contextualisation was an L2-English academic writing concept that was hard to understand.

The tutor’s notes revealed that the students had not been taught how to construct paragraphs. This explained why the concept and purpose of a topic sentence was challenging, such that students’ writing often lacked direction, *“Some writing a long introduction instead of the topic sentence.”* This was dealt with by using peer marking and also through feedback. The tutor used communicative methods around writing to help expand students’ knowledge of this L2-English concept. A related issue was the students’ progress from paragraph writing to essay writing. Firstly, there were difficulties noticed in understanding what supporting paragraphs were (i.e., sub-arguments). Students needed to recognise that a paragraph had a role in an essay. Amongst the solutions were visual methods of presenting the structure (i.e., templates), and group analysis of sample writing and of the students’ own writing. This group work helped the students develop their writing by encouraging metalanguage use.

Expressing and defending opinions was another challenge noted in the journal, *“I thought their opinions probably were not valued in school. I asked them, many students agreed.”* By asking students, the tutor then realised that writing opinions in an L2 would need to be explained for about 80% of the students, *“many of them could not give you an opinion. They tried but couldn’t.”* In fact, initial knowledge of the content of argumentative paragraphs was minimal among students, similar to what the tutor had experienced in her own university years. When students were asked to state and write about an argument, the tendency was to write a narrative about personal experiences, or a descriptive generalization about the topic, *“99% would either describe their experience or give a simplistic answer without support.”* Though students who had been preparing for the IELTS Writing test wrote more on-topic, all students had difficulty writing an argument.

Based on this, the tutor introduced a series of lessons for students to learn to express and defend their opinions. The class started writing simple topics, expressing a plain positive or negative thesis, and supporting it with a simple reason, in a ‘because’ clause. The next stage in development included making a claim, though students did not know that such claims required sourced evidence. As a result, claims were taught which forced students to create evidentiary structures, such as *“...has three advantages/benefits/pluses.”* When the class was directed to discuss (sub)arguments in support of a claim, there were difficulties in distinguishing between similar ideas, such as between the claims *“animals will suffer”* and *“animals feel pain”*. There were further problems of finding relevant arguments. The tutor intuited this as deficiencies in the students’ critical thinking faculties. However, the lack of capability could have been a result of the lack of literacy work in high school, coupled with using their L2 to acquire these capabilities (Cummins, 2016), leading to a high cognitive load.

As the course progressed, argumentation was expanded to include expressing an opinion opposite to their own (and critiquing it), *“they didn’t have difficulty with brainstorming two sides of the problem. But when they had to write the opposite argument, they got stuck.”* While the reason for this perplexed the tutor, this could have been a lack of challenging L1 reading, such that the value of the comparison of opinions was not recognised. During the process of writing, this could have been a cognitive challenge for students to balance competing opinions. Indeed, the tutor often repeated lessons on the concepts and metalanguage, as students seemed unable to retain these concepts, as a result of lacking L1 literacy experience (Hirvela, 2017).

Discussion

The present study sought to describe how a tutor’s journal could help address students’ tertiary Foundation literacy challenges. By using a journal, the tutor was able to institute a methodical problem-solving process, to analyse situations and to prepare solutions and implement them. It also allowed the tutor to better scaffold the lessons, as she was able to recognise some aspects of students’ progress. This made the tutor’s goal of organised student writing seem possible.

Regarding problem diagnosis and analysis, the journal provided a template for analysing the reasons for students’ difficulties. This was often found to derive from their lack of L1 literacy pedagogy, providing more support for the assertion that students’ L1 literacy backgrounds can indeed be an impediment to L2-literacy learning (Neff, 2013; Cumming et al., 2016). Our previous research (Dimitriou, Omurzakova & Narymbetova, 2020; see also Appendix 1) showed that students claimed that their L1 literacy were expression of opinions, independence of thought and action, writing instruction and complex writing tasks, reading analysis and reading-to-write. The students’ challenges were also noted and analysed in the journal. The meta-analysis also posited other relevant causes of literacy challenges e.g., cognitive load, or the unique L2-English tertiary nature of the writing, or students having to learn advanced literacy items for the first time in their L2 (Cummins, 2016).

The relevance of this research to tertiary literacy (in Kazakhstan) is that knowledge of low L1-literacy EMI students’ capabilities and deficiencies will allow for better scaffolded teaching, and therefore better learning, in EMI contexts. The tutor starting with reading skills, followed by small writing texts, then essays. The journal entries indicate that the tutor was directing students’ actions for the purpose of learning, including meaning-making and (peer) dialogue as ways to make students into independent scholars (Skyrme & McGee, 2016). Each classroom group has different problems and different classroom dynamics. That is why tutors can use a journal to aid their skills of diagnosis and analysis.

Our sub-question was about the particular role of a Kazakhstani non-native-English speaker tutor and her English literacy experience, and how that affected the teaching of her own tertiary literacy students. The journal indicated that the local tutor was aware of (long-term) local L1-literacy norms (hers and theirs), and she used this to aid her in recognising and analysing issues, as well as drawing upon her own literacy history (among other things) to provide solutions (see Medgyes, 1992). Furthermore, the tutor tried to show students the similarities with her own high school and Anglophone university experience, as someone like them, yet someone who has succeeded in L2 English.

The journaling also showed how language socialisation as a framework can be used to interpret dynamic classroom data to better understand the agency of tutors and students, teaching and learning processes. Literacy socialisation was seen to be not only about language, or writing, but about Anglophone tertiary writing culture, as well as cooperation and agency. The tutor’s agency was evident in her choice of teaching solutions for students. Though the journal was a tutor’s emic perspective of events, interaction and co-operation between teacher and students was evident. Students’ agency was seen in their cooperation or lack thereof.

References

- Anderson, N.J. (2007). Metacognition in writing: Facilitating writer awareness. In Stubbs, A. (Ed.), *Rhetoric, uncertainty, and the university as text: How students construct the academic experience*. (pp. 19-43) Canadian Plains Research Center.
- Ashton-Hay, S., & Doncaster, N. (2021). Student success and retention: What's academic skills got to do with it? *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 15(1),102-116.
- Burns, A. (2003). *Collaborative action research for English teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, J. (2005). The importance of teachers writing on TESOL. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* 9(2) 1-18.
- Cumming, A., Lai, C., & Cho, H. (2016). Students' writing from sources for academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 47-58.
- Cummins, J. (2016). Reflections on Cummins (1980): The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly* 50(4), 940–944.
- Delaney, Y. A. (2008). Investigating the reading-to-write construct. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(3), 140-150.
- Dimitriou, K.K., Omurzakova, D., & Narymbetova, K. (2020). L1 literacy in Kazakhstan and its effect on L2 English academic literacy. In *Proceedings of the 9th ICBCB conference*, Suleyman Demirel University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.
- Duff, P.A. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues *Language Teacher*, 40, 309-319.
- Duff, P.A. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 169-192.
- Duff, P.A. (2012). Second language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 564-586). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Duff, P.A. (2016). Language teacher identities and socialization. In Barkhuizen, G. (Ed.), *Reflections on language teacher identity research* (pp 178-183). Routledge.
- Duff, P.A., & Anderson, T. (2015). Academic language and literacy socialization for second language students. In Markee, N. (Ed.), *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 337-352). John Wiley & Sons.
- Goodman, B.A., & Montgomery, D.P. (2020). "Now I always try to stick to the point": Socialization to and from genre knowledge in an English-medium university in Kazakhstan. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 48, 1-13.
- Hirvela, A. (2017). Argumentation & second language writing: Are we missing the boat? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 36, 69-74.
- Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?": Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 87-98.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 2307-2319.

- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. Routledge.
- Keck, C. (2014). Copying, paraphrasing, and academic writing development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 summarization practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 25, 4-22.
- Macbeth, K.P. (2006). Diverse, unforeseen, and quaint difficulties. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 41(2) 180-207.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal* 46(4) 340-349.
- National Academy of Education (NAO) (2015a). *Standardized curricula for foreign language in Russian schools*. Retrieved from <https://nao.kz/loader/fromorg/2/25> on 15 July, 2018.
- National Academy of Education (NAO) (2015b). *Standardized curriculum for Russian language in Russian schools*. Retrieved from <https://nao.kz/loader/fromorg/2/25> on 15 July, 2018
- Neff-van Aertselaer, J. (2013). Contextualizing EFL argumentation writing practices within the Common European Framework descriptors. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 198-209.
- Negretti, R. (2012). Metacognition in student academic writing: Longitudinal study of metacognitive awareness and its relation to task perception, self-regulation, evaluation of performance. *Written Communication*, 29(2), 142-179.
- OECD (2018). *Education policy outlook*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/education/Education-Policy-Outlook-Country-Profile-Kazakhstan-2018.pdf> on 23 October, 2020.
- Roessingh, H. (2006). BICS-CALP: An Introduction for some, a review for others. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23(2), 91-96.
- Sharp, A. (2010). Intercultural rhetoric and reading comprehension in a second language *Reading Psychology*, 31, 472-491.
- Skyrme, G., & McGee, A. (2016). Pulled in many directions. *Teaching in Higher Education* 21(7), 759-772.
- Soltys, D. (2020). Can western-style university management be applied to Kazakhstan? A Participant-observer case study of KIMEP University. *Central Asia Business Journal* 11(3), 15-24.
- Tarnopolsky, O. (2004). Promoting EFL literacy via promoting motivation: A case for writing skills development. *TESL Reporter*, 37(1), 8-17
- Wallace, M.J. (2005). *Action research for Language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wei, X., & Zhang, W. (2020). Investigating L2 writers' metacognitive awareness about L1-L2 rhetorical differences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 46, 1-16.
- Wingate, U., & Tribble, C. (2012). The best of both worlds? Towards an English for academic purposes/academic literacies writing pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(4), 481-495.
- Yakhontova, T. (2001). Textbooks, contexts, and learners. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 397-415.
- Yassukova, L.A. (2020). *Izmenenie struktury intellekta podrostkov s 1990 po 2020 gody* (Changes in the intellectual structure of teenagers between 1990 and 2020). Lecture

Saint Petersburg psychological summit. St. Petersburg. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hLMdmsp3xaA>, on 12 August, 2020

Appendix 1 Journal data & coding overview (T- teacher, sts- students)

Entry	Topic	Similarity T/sts	Analysis/ solution	Triangulation	Critical analysis
1a	a)sts follow instructions b)tasks for independence			no experience with tasks	sts' agency
1b	-some sts regularly refused		-lazy, unmotivated -sts realised the benefit, by the end	no experience with tasks	-didn't understand tasks -could not communicate with T
2	Foundation literacy, but no independence		peer dialogue		
3	difficulty with individual routines		most independent by 2 nd half of course	no experience with tasks	-developed agency, independence
4	elements of text, metalanguage		reading before writing	aware of basic structure	
5	analysis of information/ reading (metalanguage)		Reading practice	lack of analytical reading	L2-literacy item
6	fact/ opinion/evidence (metalanguage)		long process	lack of analytical reading	L2-literacy item
7	a)analysis of source text b)no finding/ citing/ paraphrasing	yes		lack of analytical reading	L2-literacy item
8	a)no understanding of task b)missing parts of task c) sts avoid brainstorming	yes	-lack critical thinking -lack experience -peer dialog/ task analysis -brainstorming	lack of writing pedagogy	L2-literacy item
9	a) structured writing b)modifying intro/ conclusion c)contextualisation		-lack of L1 reading -lack worldly knowledge	lack of writing pedagogy	L2-literacy item
10	a)constructing paragraphs b)topic sentence c)unfocused writing		-peer marking -T feedback	lack of writing pedagogy	L2-literacy item
11	supporting paragraph/ argument		-templates -sample text group work -peer feedback	lack of writing pedagogy	L2-literacy item
12	-opinion writing -no experience (opinion) -narrative/ description	yes	-express & defend -'because' clause -claim -evidentiary structures	lack of writing pedagogy	L2-literacy item
13	a)argument quality b)argument relevance		no critical thinking	lack of writing pedagogy	- L2-literacy item - cognitive load
14	opposing arguments & critique		-perplexed -repeated lessons often -low retention of concepts/ metalanguage	lack of writing pedagogy	- L2-literacy item -lack of complex reading -cognitive load