



УДК 378.147:811.111
DOI 10.52575/2712-7451-2026-45-2-310-322
EDN OVIAHJ

Teaching English Academic Writing to Non-Linguistic Undergraduates: The BelSU Case

Elena V. Kaliuzhnaya, Larisa V. Tsurikova, Svetlana I. Tarasova

Belgorod State National Research University

85 Pobedy St., Belgorod 308015, Russia

kaludgnaya@bsuedu.ru, Tsurikova@bsuedu.ru, tarasova_s@bsuedu.ru

Abstract. Non-linguistic undergraduates need English to read international literature, take part in international projects and present research results; therefore, English academic writing becomes a necessary component of their training. The relevance of the study is determined by insufficient academic writing skills and the need for teaching methods that combine genre and process approaches. The purpose of the study is to substantiate, on the basis of the BelSU case, a transferable six-stage model for developing English academic writing competences and supporting students' earlier entry into research communication. A qualitative pedagogical-analytical study was carried out. The empirical basis was the BelSU two-step trajectory: a course in academic writing in Russian followed by a cross-curricular elective in English academic writing for non-linguistic programmes. The main difficulties are insufficient knowledge of academic genres, weak source-use skills and separation between language training and disciplinary content. The proposed model includes diagnosis, genre modelling, lexical-grammatical scaffolding, drafting with feedback, source work with academic integrity, and disciplinary integration. This trajectory gave students experience in finding, citing and formatting foreign sources and mastering the structure of a research article; by the end of the third year, they prepared publication-oriented texts for a local foreign-language journal. English academic writing should be treated as academic literacy and a way of entering professional discourse communities. The novelty of the BelSU case lies in linking Russian-language preparation, English academic writing and publication-oriented results; further verification requires quantitative indicators of participation, publication readiness, source-use quality and error dynamics.

Keywords: academic writing, English for Academic Purposes, non-linguistic university, academic literacies, genre approach, process approach, disciplinary integration, BelSU

For citation: Kaliuzhnaya E.V., Tsurikova L.V., Tarasova S.I. 2026. Teaching English Academic Writing to Non-Linguistic Undergraduates: The BelSU Case. *Issues in Journalism Education, Linguistics*, 45(2): 310–322. DOI: 10.52575/2712-7451-2026-45-2-310-322 EDN: OVIAHJ

Обучение академическому письму на английском языке студентов неязыковых направлений: кейс БелГУ

Калюжная Е.В., Цурикова Л.В., Тарасова С.И.

Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет

Россия, 308015, Белгород, ул. Победы, д. 85

kaludgnaya@bsuedu.ru; Tsurikova@bsuedu.ru; tarasova_s@bsuedu.ru

Аннотация. Студентам неязыковых направлений необходимо читать зарубежные научные труды, участвовать в международных проектах и представлять результаты исследований; поэтому академическое письмо на английском языке становится необходимым компонентом их подготовки. Актуальность работы обусловлена недостаточной сформированностью таких навыков и потребностью в методиках, объединяющих жанровый и процессный подходы. Цель исследования –

обосновать на материале кейса БелГУ адаптируемую шестиступенчатую модель формирования компетенций академического письма на английском языке, обеспечивающую более раннее включение студентов в исследовательскую коммуникацию. Проведено качественное педагогико-аналитическое исследование; эмпирическую основу составила двухступенчатая траектория БелГУ: курс академического письма на русском языке и сквозной электив по академическому письму на английском языке для неязыковых направлений. Основные трудности связаны с недостаточным знанием академических жанров, слабыми навыками работы с источниками и разрывом между языковой подготовкой и профильными дисциплинами. Предложенная модель включает диагностику, жанровое моделирование, лексико-грамматическую поддержку, поэтапное письмо с обратной связью, работу с источниками и дисциплинарную интеграцию. Показано, что траектория формирует опыт поиска, цитирования и оформления зарубежных источников и освоения структуры научной статьи; к окончанию третьего курса студенты подготовили публикационно-ориентированные тексты для локального журнала на иностранном языке. Академическое письмо следует рассматривать как форму академической грамотности и способ включения в профессиональное дискурсивное сообщество. Новизна кейса БелГУ заключается в соединении русскоязычной подготовки, англоязычного академического письма и публикационно-ориентированного результата; дальнейшая проверка модели требует количественных показателей участия, публикационной готовности текстов, качества работы с источниками и динамики ошибок.

Ключевые слова: академическое письмо, English for Academic Purposes, неязыковой университет, академическая грамотность, жанровый подход, процессный подход, дисциплинарная интеграция, БелГУ

Для цитирования: Kaliuzhnaya E.V., Tsurikova L.V., Tarasova S.I. 2026. Teaching English Academic Writing to Non-Linguistic Undergraduates: The BelSU Case. *Issues in Journalism Education, Linguistics*, 45(2): 310–322. DOI: 10.52575/2712-7451-2026-45-2-310-322 EDN: OVIAHJ

Introduction

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) has moved from the periphery of language education to the centre of contemporary higher education policy. In a university where students are expected to read international literature, take part in exchange programmes, prepare conference papers and communicate with specialists from other countries, the ability to produce a coherent written text in English is not an optional competence. It is one of the conditions of academic participation. This is especially relevant for non-linguistic programmes, where English is normally taught within a limited number of classroom hours and has to serve several aims at once: general communication, professional communication, reading, presentation skills and academic writing. The difficulty of the task is that academic writing cannot be reduced to the correction of grammar mistakes. A grammatically accurate paragraph may still fail as an academic text if it has no clear purpose, does not correspond to a recognisable genre, uses sources mechanically or does not build an argument. Conversely, a student with intermediate language proficiency may become a more effective academic writer if instruction helps him or her understand how academic discourse functions, how claims are supported, how textual authority is created and how disciplinary knowledge is organised in writing [Lea, Street, 1998; Hyland, 2006; Lillis, Scott, 2007].

The BelSU case is significant because it reflects a typical situation in Russian higher education. Students of economics, management, natural sciences, engineering, social sciences and other non-philological fields need English for academic purposes but do not receive the same linguistic training as students majoring in languages. Their writing experience is often fragmented. They may translate sentences, write short answers, prepare presentations or complete grammar exercises, but they rarely pass through the full cycle of academic writing: reading sources, extracting information, making notes, planning, drafting, revising, editing and reflecting on feedback. The course designer must therefore connect language instruction with the real academic actions that students perform in the university.



The relevance of the present study is determined by the internationalisation of university education, the expansion of publication and conference requirements, and the methodological need to adapt EAP research to the conditions of Russian non-linguistic universities, where time, proficiency and institutional resources are limited. Current studies describe EAP needs, genre and process approaches, academic literacies and the introduction of academic writing into Russian higher education [Lea, Street, 1998; Hyland, 2006; Lillis, Scott, 2007; Morozova, Melnikov, 2020; Korotkina, 2021]. However, less attention has been given to an institutional sequence that combines preliminary Russian-language academic writing, English source-based writing and publication-oriented outcomes for non-linguistic undergraduates; this gap determines the focus of the present study.

The purpose of the study is to substantiate, on the basis of the BelSU cross-curricular elective case, a transferable six-stage model for developing English academic writing competences in non-linguistic undergraduate programmes that supports students' earlier entry into research communication. The model is constructed after identifying typical difficulties in students' academic writing: insufficient genre awareness, weak source-use skills, limited academic vocabulary, insufficient cohesion, absence of multi-stage drafting habits and separation between language instruction and disciplinary content. The scientific novelty of the paper lies in the analytical interpretation of a sequential BelSU solution: a preliminary Academic Writing course in Russian followed by a cross-curricular elective in academic writing in a foreign language, implemented across most non-linguistic fields of study. Unlike a single language-skills module, this trajectory connects genre knowledge, source-based writing, academic integrity and disciplinary topics, and leads students towards publication-oriented writing by the end of the third undergraduate year. The practical significance consists in the possibility of using the proposed model for syllabi, classroom tasks, assessment criteria, methodological support and publication-preparation routes for students in non-linguistic programmes.

Theoretical basis of the study

The theoretical basis of academic writing instruction is formed by several complementary traditions. The first is English for Academic Purposes. EAP studies language as a tool for participation in academic contexts and pays attention to the tasks, genres, lexis and rhetorical conventions that learners need in a particular institutional setting [Hyland, Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Hyland, 2006]. In this perspective, a writing course begins not with a universal list of grammar topics but with an analysis of learner needs and target situations. For non-linguistic students, these situations include reading discipline-related articles, writing summaries, preparing reports, formulating research questions and using sources ethically.

The second tradition is genre analysis. J.M. Swales [Swales, 1990] showed that academic genres are organised by communicative purposes and by the expectations of discourse communities. This idea is crucial for undergraduate instruction because students often believe that all academic texts are written according to one abstract rule. In reality, an abstract, a summary, a literature review paragraph, a case analysis, a laboratory report, a problem-solution essay and a research introduction perform different tasks and therefore have different structures. Genre instruction helps students see not only what a text looks like but why it is organised in that way.

The third theoretical foundation is the academic literacies approach, developed in higher-education writing studies by M.R. Lea and B.V. Street and later expanded by T. Lillis and M. Scott [Lea, Street, 1998; Lillis, Scott, 2007]. It broadens the concept of writing by showing that student texts are connected with knowledge-making, identity, institutional expectations and conventions of legitimacy. This approach is especially relevant for non-linguistic students. Their difficulties are not always caused by insufficient English. They may be uncertain about what counts as evidence, how much personal opinion is acceptable, how to evaluate sources, or how to signal caution when making a claim. Academic literacies therefore require teachers to make hidden expectations visible.

The fourth component is the process-genre approach. Product-oriented teaching asks students to submit a final text and then evaluates the number of errors. Process-oriented teaching introduces planning, drafting, feedback and revision. Genre-oriented teaching gives students models and rhetorical tools. The combination of these approaches allows teachers to develop both awareness of text conventions and control over writing procedures [Badger, White, 2000; Wingate, 2012]. For non-linguistic undergraduates, this combination is more realistic than a purely theoretical course in rhetoric or a purely grammatical course in English.

Finally, linguistic scaffolding remains an indispensable element of EAP. Students need academic vocabulary, formulaic sequences, cohesive devices, reporting verbs, hedging expressions and the grammar of complex noun phrases [Biber et al., 1999; Coxhead, 2000]. However, these elements should not be taught as isolated lists. They must be connected with communicative purposes: defining concepts, comparing positions, presenting data, reporting previous research, expressing limitations and drawing conclusions. In this sense, language work serves academic action.

Materials and methods

The study is qualitative and analytical in nature. Its empirical basis is the BelSU teaching case, understood as a local pedagogical situation in which academic writing in a foreign language is taught to non-philological undergraduates through a sequential curricular trajectory. The case involved non-linguistic undergraduate programmes of Belgorod State National Research University, including students from economics, management, natural sciences, engineering, social sciences and related fields. The trajectory included two connected components: first, a preliminary course in academic writing in Russian, and second, a cross-curricular elective in academic writing in a foreign language introduced across most areas of training. The observed educational trajectory covered the period before completion of the third undergraduate year, when students prepared publication-oriented texts for a local foreign-language journal. The article treats this case not as a controlled experiment but as a source of pedagogical evidence that can be interpreted in the light of EAP scholarship and adapted to similar institutional contexts.

Because the available institutional documentation did not aggregate all cohorts into one statistically stable experimental sample, the present article does not artificially report a single local N or achievement percentage. Instead, it specifies observable outcome indicators of the BelSU case: the sequence of training, the publication-oriented task after the third year, the use of foreign sources, citation and reference-list practice, mastery of article structure and formats, and development of academic lexical-syntactic patterns. At the next stage of the project, these indicators should be operationalised quantitatively through the number of participants, the percentage of students who reach a publication-ready level, and the dynamics of error reduction and source-use quality across drafts.

The first method used in the study is theoretical analysis. It made it possible to relate the BelSU material to the main concepts of EAP, genre pedagogy, process writing, academic literacies and interdisciplinary language education. This step was necessary because a local course cannot be improved only by adding more exercises; it requires a conceptual framework explaining what academic writing is and what competences it includes.

The second method is content analysis of typical academic tasks. The tasks considered include summaries, abstracts, essay paragraphs, reports, literature-based responses, short research introductions, presentation scripts and exam-oriented written answers. These tasks were grouped according to their communicative purpose, expected structure, use of sources and degree of disciplinary relevance. The analysis revealed that many writing assignments in non-linguistic programmes are hybrid: they combine elements of translation, retelling, opinion writing and academic reporting without clear genre boundaries.

The third method is case-study interpretation. It allowed the BelSU situation to be reconstructed as a transferable problem rather than as an isolated institutional episode. The



interpretation took into account typical constraints of Russian higher education: heterogeneous English proficiency, limited contact hours, large groups, strong assessment traditions, and the need to coordinate language courses with the content of major disciplines [Ibatova, 2020; Shpit, Kurovskii, 2020].

The fourth method is pedagogical modelling. On the basis of the identified difficulties, a six-stage model of academic writing instruction was developed. The model does not describe a single lesson plan. It describes the logic of a course: diagnosis, genre awareness, language support, staged writing, source work and disciplinary integration. Each stage includes a specific instructional aim, classroom practices and expected learning outcomes.

Results and discussion

The analysis of the BelSU case made it possible to identify a stable set of difficulties that prevent non-linguistic undergraduates from developing effective academic writing skills in English. These difficulties are systemic. They arise not only from students' language proficiency but also from the way writing has traditionally been taught and assessed.

The first difficulty is the reduction of writing to linguistic correctness. Students often believe that a good English text is a text without grammar mistakes. Teachers, especially under conditions of limited time, may also focus on vocabulary and grammar because they are visible and easy to correct. As a result, the deeper properties of academic writing remain underdeveloped: purpose, audience, argument, evidence, paragraph logic and genre. This explains why some students produce texts that are formally correct but rhetorically weak. A course in academic writing must therefore expand assessment criteria. Accuracy should be evaluated together with structure, coherence, source use and adequacy to the task.

The second difficulty is genre uncertainty. Many students do not clearly distinguish between a summary and an abstract, an opinion essay and a problem-solution essay, a report and a literature-based analysis. They may write one long paragraph instead of an introduction, body and conclusion; they may include personal evaluation in a summary; or they may copy the structure of a Russian-language school essay when preparing an English academic task. Genre uncertainty is not a minor problem because genres organise expectations. If students do not know the genre, they cannot make appropriate decisions about content, order, style or citation [Swales, 1990; Nesi, Gardner, 2012].

The third difficulty concerns source-based writing. Non-linguistic students frequently work with English sources through translation. They may copy fragments, translate them literally, replace a few words or combine several passages without building their own authorial position. Such writing is not always intentional plagiarism. It often reflects the absence of training in note-taking, paraphrasing, summarising and reporting. Students need explicit instruction in how to separate their own voice from the voice of the source, how to use reporting verbs, how to introduce evidence and how to compile a reference list [Swales, Feak, 2012; Dobrynina, 2019].

The fourth difficulty is insufficient academic vocabulary and weak cohesion. Even when students know everyday English, they may not have the lexical means to define a concept, describe a tendency, compare theoretical positions, indicate cause and effect, or express a cautious conclusion. They may use short simple sentences and repeat the same verbs, which makes the text sound informal and fragmented. Academic vocabulary lists and corpora are useful, but they should be transformed into functional classroom tools: phrases for establishing a research gap, comparing findings, stating limitations, describing methodology and drawing implications [Biber et al., 1999; Coxhead, 2000].

The fifth difficulty is the absence of a multi-stage writing culture. Many students view writing as a one-time act: they write a text, submit it and receive a grade. Planning, drafting, peer review and revision are often perceived as unnecessary additional work. However, academic writing is iterative by nature. Strong texts are normally produced through several stages of decision-making. If students are not taught to revise, teacher comments remain external criticism

rather than a tool for development. Therefore, the course should institutionalise drafting: at least some assignments must require an outline, a first draft, feedback and a revised version [Badger, White, 2000; Nation, 2007].

The sixth difficulty is the gap between language instruction and disciplinary content. When students of management or biology write about general topics that have little connection with their field, they may complete the task mechanically. By contrast, writing becomes meaningful when it is connected with disciplinary problems, professional cases or research questions. Disciplinary integration does not mean that language teachers must become subject specialists. It means that they select topics, genres and sources in cooperation with major departments whenever possible [Flowerdew, Peacock, 2001; Basharov et al., 2024]. Recent evidence also supports this conclusion: task-based writing courses for non-English majors show stronger results when writing tasks imitate authentic academic and professional purposes rather than isolated grammatical exercises [Kang et al., 2024].

The specificity of the BelSU case is therefore not merely the use of a standard EAP module. The novelty consists in a sequential and cross-curricular implementation: a preliminary Academic Writing course in Russian was followed by an elective in academic writing in a foreign language introduced across most non-linguistic directions. This sequence reduced the cognitive load of immediate transition to English-language research writing: students first clarified the logic of academic article structure, argumentation, citation and research ethics in Russian, and then transferred these actions into English.

The publication-oriented outcome of this trajectory is especially important for early entry into science. By the end of the third undergraduate year, students had experience of preparing texts for a local foreign-language journal whose formal requirements were intentionally approximated to those of international scholarly journals: title, abstract, keywords, introduction, source review, methods or case description, results, discussion, conclusion and references. The course therefore developed not only linguistic accuracy but also the practical research actions required for publication: searching for foreign sources, selecting relevant literature, integrating quotations and paraphrases, formatting citations and references, and mastering the lexical-syntactic patterns of academic and scientific written style.

The comparative value of this local case can be clarified through recent studies. X. Kang, S. Kotchasit and P. Nilnookoon [Kang et al., 2024] report an intervention with 40 first-year non-English major students at Xi'an University: the course was implemented through eight lesson plans over 32 instructional hours, and writing scores increased from $M = 39.98$ to $M = 43.95$ out of 60 points (from 66.6% to 73.3% of the maximum score, a gain of 6.6 percentage points; $p = 0.001$), while overall satisfaction reached $M = 4.43$ on a five-point scale. B.B. Lumines [Lumines, 2025], in a 2025 qualitative study of 15 non-English major undergraduates, shows that planning, monitoring, revising, elaboration and self-evaluation are associated with better coherence and clarity, although grammatical and cohesion problems remain persistent. These findings support the BelSU assumption that students enter research communication faster and more effectively when academic writing competences are developed already during undergraduate training, especially at the first stages of research socialisation.

On the basis of these findings and the BelSU publication-oriented trajectory, the article proposes a six-stage model of teaching English academic writing to non-linguistic undergraduates. The model is cumulative and cyclical: each stage prepares the next one, but source work, feedback and disciplinary integration return at every new genre and at every new research task.

Stage 1 is diagnostic writing and needs analysis. At the beginning of the course, students complete a short written task related to their field of study. For example, they may summarise a short text, explain a professional concept, or respond to a research-based question. The teacher analyses not only grammar and vocabulary but also task interpretation, paragraphing, coherence, use of evidence and ability to formulate a claim. The results help identify groups of students who need additional support and help the teacher choose the most relevant genres for the course [Hyland, 2006].



Stage 2 is genre modelling. Students work with model texts and learn to identify their communicative purpose, macrostructure and typical language features. A useful classroom procedure includes three steps: first, students read a model and discuss what the writer is trying to achieve; second, they mark rhetorical moves; third, they create a genre checklist. For an abstract, the checklist may include background, purpose, methods, results and conclusion. For a problem-solution essay, it may include problem definition, causes, possible solutions, evaluation and final recommendation. Such modelling gives students a visible map of the text.

Stage 3 is lexical and grammatical scaffolding. At this stage, the teacher introduces the language that students need for the genre. If students are writing a literature-based paragraph, they practise reporting verbs such as argue, demonstrate, suggest, indicate and emphasise. If they are comparing theories, they practise contrastive connectors and comparative structures. If they are describing results, they work with cautious claims and passive constructions. Scaffolding is effective when it is immediately followed by guided output: students use the phrases in their own sentences and receive feedback on appropriateness, not only on correctness [Swain, 1985; Nation, 2007].

Stage 4 is step-by-step writing with feedback. A substantial assignment should be divided into several smaller actions: understanding the task, collecting ideas, preparing an outline, writing the first draft, receiving peer feedback, revising, editing and submitting the final version. Peer review should not be general. Students need a checklist that directs attention to genre, thesis statement, paragraph unity, evidence, citation and language. Teacher feedback should also be selective. If every error is marked, students may become passive. If feedback focuses on two or three priorities, revision becomes manageable.

Stage 5 is source work and academic integrity. This stage is central for university writing. Students should learn to locate relevant sources, distinguish between reliable and unreliable materials, extract key ideas, make notes without copying, paraphrase, summarise and cite. In the BelSU elective, this stage was directly connected with publication-oriented tasks: students searched for recent foreign sources, selected literature for their disciplinary topic, practised in-text citation and reference-list formatting, and compared the formal requirements of the local foreign-language journal with the requirements typical of international journals. A practical sequence may begin with one source and later move to two or three sources. At the first level, students write a source summary. At the second level, they compare two positions. At the third level, they use several sources to support their own argument. This gradual movement prevents compilation and develops authorial voice.

Stage 6 is disciplinary and interdisciplinary integration. At this stage, the writing course becomes connected with the students' academic specialisation. The teacher may invite students to choose a topic from their major, use a short article recommended by a subject lecturer, or write a mini-report related to a current professional problem. Assessment criteria should include both academic writing features and disciplinary relevance. For the BelSU case, this stage is represented by the transition from classroom genres to student articles after the third year, when the learners apply source work, article structure and academic style conventions in texts that are closer to real research communication. This stage is important because transfer does not happen automatically. Students may write a good classroom essay but fail to use the same skills in a course paper unless the connection is made explicit [Bruce, 2008; Basherov et al., 2024].

Assessment in the proposed model must be transparent. A rubric may include five blocks: task achievement and genre, structure and coherence, use of sources, academic language, and accuracy. Each block can be evaluated on a scale from basic to advanced. Such a rubric helps students understand that academic writing is multidimensional. It also protects the teacher from reducing assessment to grammatical error counting. In addition, students can use the same rubric before submission, which turns assessment into a learning instrument.

Feedback is another key element of the model. In many university courses, feedback is given only after the final version has been graded. This practice has limited pedagogical value because

students cannot use the comments to improve the same text. A feedback-rich course should provide comments during the writing process. Peer feedback is useful for developing reader awareness, while teacher feedback is necessary for genre, argument and language accuracy. Digital tools may support this process, but they cannot replace explicit criteria and classroom discussion.

The proposed model also changes the role of reading. In an EAP course, reading is not only a receptive skill. It is preparation for writing. Students read model texts to observe genre features, read sources to collect evidence, read their peers' drafts to develop evaluative judgement and read their own drafts to revise. This integration of reading and writing reflects the way academic communication works in real disciplinary contexts [Johns, 1997; Hyland, 2006].

An important issue is the heterogeneity of student proficiency. Non-linguistic groups often include learners with very different levels of English. The model responds to this problem through scaffolding and differentiated outcomes. All students may analyse the same model text, but stronger students can produce a more independent argument, while weaker students can work with sentence frames and guided paragraphs. The aim is not to lower standards but to provide routes by which students can gradually approach academic performance.

The model can be implemented within different course formats. In a one-semester module, the teacher may focus on a limited set of genres: summary, abstract, literature-based paragraph and short report. In a two-semester course, students may also write a problem-solution essay, an annotated bibliography and a mini-research introduction. If classroom hours are very limited, some stages can be partly moved to independent work, but the logic of diagnosis, modelling, drafting and revision should remain visible.

Institutional conditions are also significant. Academic writing cannot be developed successfully if it is treated only as an individual teacher's enthusiasm. Departments should recognise writing as a cross-curricular competence and as a mechanism of early research socialisation. The BelSU case shows that the effect becomes more visible when academic writing is built into a sequence: first through Russian-language academic writing, then through foreign-language academic writing, and finally through publication-oriented student texts. Language teachers need access to discipline-related materials, while subject specialists need to understand what kind of writing support students receive in English classes. The BelSU case therefore points to a broader institutional conclusion: the development of EAP requires coordinated curricular design, not only methodological innovation [Morozova, Melnikov, 2020; Korotkina, 2021; Kang et al., 2024].

There are, however, limitations to the proposed model. It is based on qualitative interpretation and pedagogical modelling rather than on a completed statistical measurement of all BelSU cohorts. This limitation is important because the next stage of research should report the exact number of participants, the duration of the intervention for each cohort, the percentage of students who prepare publication-ready texts, and the percentage improvement in source use, genre structure, coherence and error reduction. Further research may include classroom experimentation, analysis of student drafts before and after instruction, interviews with students and teachers, and comparison of writing tasks across different non-linguistic programmes. Such research would make it possible to evaluate which elements of the model have the strongest effect on student writing development.

Despite these limitations, the model has practical value because it translates international EAP theory into a sequence of teachable and institutionally visible actions. It shows how the abstract concepts of genre, academic literacy, process writing, source-based writing and disciplinary integration can become classroom procedures and publication-oriented practices. The model also respects the realities of Russian higher education: limited contact hours, mixed proficiency, examination pressure and the need to combine general English with professional English (See Table).



Six-stage model of academic writing instruction
Шестиступенчатая модель обучения академическому письму

Stage	Instructional aim	Classroom instruments	Expected result
1. Diagnosis	Identify language, genre and source-use needs	Short field-related task, teacher analysis, learner profile	Individual and group priorities are visible
2. Genre modelling	Make rhetorical structure explicit	Model texts, move analysis, genre checklist	Students understand purpose and text organisation
3. Scaffolding	Provide functional academic language	Academic lexis, reporting verbs, hedging, cohesion	Students use language for academic action
4. Drafting	Develop process writing habits	Outline, first draft, peer review, teacher comments, revision	Writing becomes iterative and controlled
5. Source work	Form academic integrity and authorial voice	Note-taking, summary, paraphrase, citation, reference list	Students integrate sources ethically
6. Integration	Connect writing with the major discipline	Discipline-related topics, subject texts, joint criteria	Writing transfers to professional communication

Conclusions

The study allows several conclusions to be drawn. First, English academic writing in a non-linguistic university should be understood as a form of academic literacy. It includes language accuracy, but it also includes genre awareness, argumentation, source use, textual cohesion, stance and revision. Therefore, teaching writing only through grammar exercises or final-product correction is insufficient.

Second, the difficulties experienced by non-linguistic undergraduates are systemic. They are connected with students' previous writing experience, the hidden conventions of academic discourse, limited vocabulary, weak source work and the separation of language classes from disciplinary content. These difficulties require an integrated pedagogical response rather than separate corrective exercises.

Third, the BelSU case can be reconstructed as a model of course design with a clearly specified institutional novelty. The proposed six-stage model includes diagnostic writing and needs analysis, genre modelling, lexical and grammatical scaffolding, step-by-step drafting with feedback, source-based writing and academic integrity, and disciplinary integration; however, its distinctive feature is the two-step trajectory from academic writing in Russian to academic writing in a foreign language across most non-linguistic programmes. The model can be adapted to different majors, course lengths and student proficiency levels, especially when the final tasks are linked with real research genres and publication requirements.

Fourth, early development of foreign-language academic writing competences can accelerate students' entry into scientific communication. In the BelSU trajectory, the main own result was a publication-oriented sequence of student work: learners searched for foreign sources, selected and cited relevant literature, prepared reference lists, mastered article structure and used academic lexical-syntactic patterns in texts for a local foreign-language journal by the end of the third undergraduate year. This result confirms that the proposed two-step trajectory shifts academic writing from an auxiliary language exercise to a controlled mechanism of early research socialisation.

Fifth, academic writing instruction should be supported institutionally. Cooperation between language teachers and subject specialists, transparent assessment criteria, appropriate materials and recognition of writing as a university-wide competence are necessary conditions for sustainable development. In this sense, the teaching of English academic writing is not only a language-teaching issue but also a matter of educational quality and research capacity building.

Thus, teaching English academic writing to non-linguistic undergraduates should be organised as purposeful induction into academic and professional discourse communities. When students understand how texts work, why sources are used, how arguments are structured and how revision improves meaning, writing becomes not a peripheral exercise but a tool of learning and research communication. The immediate practical recommendation is to embed academic writing competences earlier in undergraduate curricula and to evaluate them not only by grammar accuracy but also by genre control, quality of source use, revision dynamics and readiness for publication-oriented research communication.

References

- Badger R., White G. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2):153–160. DOI: 10.1093/elt/54.2.153
- Basherov O.I., Sachkova E.V., Kardovich I.K., Baryshnikova O.V. 2024. Integration of the English language into the professional training of students of non-linguistic specialties: an interdisciplinary approach. *Education Management Review*, 14(2–1): 205–214 (in Russian). DOI: 10.25726/r6263-8293-7031-b
- Belyaeva E.G. 2022. Methodological model of teaching academic writing to undergraduate students. *Focus on Language Education and Research*, 3(1): 36–51 (in Russian). DOI: 10.35213/2686-7516-2022-3-1-36-51
- Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E. 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Harlow, Longman, 1204 p.
- Bruce I. 2008. Academic Writing and Genre: A Systematic Analysis. London, Continuum, 194 p.
- Butler D.B., Trosclair E., Zhou Y., Wei M. 2014. Student and Teacher Perceptions of Academic English Writing in Russia. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 2(2): 203–227. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2735380
- Coxhead A. 2000. A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2): 213–238. DOI: 10.2307/3587951
- Dobrynina O.L. 2019. Academic writing for research publication purposes. *Lifelong education the XXI century*, 1(25): 92–100 (in Russian). DOI: 10.15393/j5.art.2019.4485
- Flowerdew J., Peacock M. 2001. Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 484 p. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139524766
- Hyland K. 2006. English for Academic Purposes. London, Routledge, 356 p.
- Hyland K., Hamp-Lyons L. 2002. EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1(1): 1–12. DOI: 10.1016/S1475-1585(02)00002-4
- Ibatova A.Z. 2020. Teaching academic writing of students-bachelors of a non-language university. *Azimuth of Scientific Research: Pedagogy and Psychology*, 9(1(30)): 126–128 (in Russian). DOI: 10.26140/anip-2020-0901-0075
- "Inostrannyi yazyk" dlya neyazykovykh vuzov i fakul'tetov [Approximate syllabus for the discipline "Foreign Language" for non-linguistic higher education institutions and faculties]. 2009. Primernaya programma. Moscow, 24 p. URL: <https://www.fgosvo.ru/uploadfiles/ppd/20110329000911.pdf> (accessed: April 15, 2026).
- Johns A.M. 1997. Text, Role and Context: Developing Academic Literacies. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 171 p. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139524650
- Kang X., Kotchasit S., Nilnopkoon P. 2024. Developing College English Writing Course by Using Length Approach Combined with Task-based Learning to Enhance Writing Skills of Non-English Major Students in Xi'an University. *International Journal of Sociologies and Anthropologies Science Reviews*, 4(6): 417–428. DOI: 10.60027/ijssar.2024.4932
- Korotkina I. 2021. Academic Writing in Russia Beyond Zero Point. In: Emerging Writing Research from the Russian Federation. Ed. L.A. Squires. Fort Collins, CO, The WAC Clearinghouse; Boulder, CO, University Press of Colorado: 17–50. DOI: 10.37514/INT-B.2021.1428.2.01



- Lea M.R., Street B.V. 1998. Student writing in higher education: an academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2): 157–172. DOI: 10.1080/03075079812331380364
- Lillis T.M., Scott M. 2007. Defining Academic Literacies Research: Issues of Epistemology, Ideology and Strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4, 5–32. DOI: 10.1558/japl.v4i1.5
- Lumines B.B. 2025. Cognitive Writing Strategies and Error Patterns in Academic Research Writing among Non-English Major Undergraduates. *TPM – Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 32(3-September): 76–82. URL: <https://tpmap.org/submission/index.php/tpm/article/view/1760> (accessed: May 25, 2026).
- Morozova M.A., Melnikov M.V. 2020. The Relevance of Introducing the Practice of Academic Writing in the Content of Language Courses of a Non-Linguistic University. *Otechestvennaya i zarubezhnaya pedagogika*, 1(4(69)): 151–163.
- Nation P. 2007. The Four Strands. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1): 2–13. DOI: 10.2167/illt039.0
- Nesi H., Gardner S., Chapelle C.A., Hunston S. 2012. Genres across the Disciplines: Student Writing in Higher Education. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 288 p.
- Shpit E.I., Kurovskiy V.N. 2020. Academic Writing in English in the Structure of Higher Education in Russia. *Higher Education in Russia*, 29(2): 83–91. DOI: 10.31992/0869-3617-2020-29-2-83-91
- Swain M. 1985. Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In: *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Eds. S. Gass, C. Madden. Rowley, MA, Newbury House: 235–253.
- Swales J.M. 1990. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 260 p.
- Swales J.M., Feak C.B. 2012. Academic Writing for Graduate Students. 3rd Edition: Essential Tasks and Skills. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 418 p.
- Wingate U. 2012. Using Academic Literacies and genre-based models for academic writing instruction: a “literacy” journey. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(1): 26–37. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeap.2011.11.006

Список литературы

- Badger R., White G. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2): 153–160. DOI: 10.1093/elt/54.2.153
- Башеров О.И., Сачкова Е.В., Кардович И.К., Барышникова О.В. 2024. Интеграция английского языка в профессиональную подготовку студентов неязыковых специальностей: междисциплинарный подход. *Управление образованием: теория и практика*, 14(2–1): 205–214. DOI: 10.25726/r6263-8293-7031-b
- Belyaeva E.G. 2022. Methodological model of teaching academic writing to undergraduate students. *Focus on Language Education and Research*, 3(1): 36–51 (in Russian). DOI: 10.35213/2686-7516-2022-3-1-36-51
- Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E. 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Harlow, Longman, 1204 p.
- Bruce I. 2008. Academic Writing and Genre: A Systematic Analysis. London, Continuum, 194 p.
- Butler D.B., Trosclair E., Zhou Y., Wei M. 2014. Student and Teacher Perceptions of Academic English Writing in Russia. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 2(2): 203–227. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2735380
- Coxhead A. 2000. A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2): 213–238. DOI: 10.2307/3587951
- Добрынина О.Л. 2019. Академическое письмо для научно-публикационных целей. *Непрерывное образование: XXI век*, (25): 92–100 (In Russian). DOI: 10.15393/j5.art.2019.4485
- Flowerdew J., Peacock M. 2001. Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 484 p. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139524766
- Hyland K. 2006. English for Academic Purposes. London, Routledge, 356 p.
- Hyland K., Hamp-Lyons L. 2002. EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1(1): 1–12. DOI: 10.1016/S1475-1585(02)00002-4
- Ибатова А.З. 2020. Обучение академическому письму студентов-бакалавров неязыкового вуза. *Азимут научных исследований: педагогика и психология*, 9(1(30)): 126–128. DOI: 10.26140/anip-2020-0901-0075

- "Иностранный язык" для неязыковых вузов и факультетов. Примерная программа. 2009. Москва, 24 с. URL: <https://www.fgosvo.ru/uploadfiles/ppd/20110329000911.pdf> (accessed: April 15, 2026).
- Johns A.M. 1997. Text, Role and Context: Developing Academic Literacies. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 171 p. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139524650
- Kang X., Kotchasit S., Nilnopkoon P. 2024. Developing College English Writing Course by Using Length Approach Combined with Task-based Learning to Enhance Writing Skills of Non-English Major Students in Xi'an University. *International Journal of Sociologies and Anthropologies Science Reviews*, 4(6): 417–428. DOI: 10.60027/ijssr.2024.4932
- Korotkina I. 2021. Academic Writing in Russia Beyond Zero Point. In: *Emerging Writing Research from the Russian Federation*. Ed. L.A. Squires. Fort Collins, CO, The WAC Clearinghouse; Boulder, CO, University Press of Colorado: 17–50. DOI: 10.37514/INT-B.2021.1428.2.01
- Lea M.R., Street B.V. 1998. Student writing in higher education: an academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2): 157–172. DOI: 10.1080/03075079812331380364
- Lillis T.M., Scott M. 2007. Defining Academic Literacies Research: Issues of Epistemology, Ideology and Strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4, 5–32. DOI: 10.1558/japl.v4i1.5
- Lumines B.B. 2025. Cognitive Writing Strategies and Error Patterns in Academic Research Writing among Non-English Major Undergraduates. *TPM – Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 32(3-September): 76–82. URL: <https://tpmap.org/submission/index.php/tpm/article/view/1760> (accessed: May 25, 2026).
- Морозова М.А., Мельников М.В. 2020. Актуальность введения практики академического письма в содержание курсов языковых дисциплин неязыкового вуза. *Отечественная и зарубежная педагогика*, 1(4(69)): 151–163.
- Nation P. 2007. The Four Strands. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1): 2–13. DOI: 10.2167/illt039.0
- Nesi H., Gardner S., Chapelle C.A., Hunston S. 2012. Genres across the Disciplines: Student Writing in Higher Education. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 288 p.
- Шпит Е.И., Куровский В.Н. 2020. Англоязычное академическое письмо в структуре отечественного высшего образования. *Высшее образование в России*, 29(2): 83–91. DOI: 10.31992/0869-3617-2020-29-2-83-91
- Swain M. 1985. Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In: *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Eds. S. Gass, C. Madden. Rowley, MA, Newbury House: 235–253.
- Swales J.M. 1990. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 260 p.
- Swales J.M., Feak C.B. 2012. Academic Writing for Graduate Students. 3rd Edition: Essential Tasks and Skills. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 418 p.
- Wingate U. 2012. Using Academic Literacies and genre-based models for academic writing instruction: a "literacy" journey. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(1): 26–37. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeap.2011.11.006

Конфликт интересов: о потенциальном конфликте интересов не сообщалось.

Conflict of interest: no potential conflict of interest related to this article was reported.

Поступила в редакцию 13.05.2026

Received May 13, 2026

Поступила после рецензирования 02.06.2026

Revised June 02, 2026

Принята к публикации 03.06.2026

Accepted June 03, 2026

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Калюжная Елена Вячеславовна, кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков и профессиональной коммуникации, Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет, г. Белгород, Россия.

Elena V. Kaliuzhnaya, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages and Professional Communication, Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod, Russia.



Цурикова Лариса Владимировна, кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков и профессиональной коммуникации, Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет, г. Белгород, Россия.

Larisa V. Tsurikova, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages and Professional Communication, Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod, Russia.

Тарасова Светлана Ивановна, кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры педагогики, Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет, г. Белгород, Россия.

Svetlana I. Tarasova, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Pedagogy, Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod, Russia.