

Online ISSN 2335-2388



RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS

2014 Nr. 25 (30)

RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS Nr. 25 (30)

MOKSLINIS TĖSTINIS LEIDINYS

Leidžia Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas ir Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Humanitarinis fakultetas Kielcuose du kartus per metus (balandžio 25 d. ir spalio 25 d.).

Mokslo kryptis: filologija (04H). Mokslo sritys: gramatika, semantika, semiotika, sintaksė (H 352), bendroji ir lyginamoji literatūra, literatūros kritika, literatūros teorija (H 390).

Pagrindinės kalbos: lietuvių, lenkų, anglų, rusų.

CZASOPISMO NAUKOWE

Wydawcy: Uniwersytet Wileński – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie oraz Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kielcach. Ukazuje się dwa razy w roku: 25 kwietnia i 25 października.

Kierunek naukowy: filologia (04H). Dyscypliny naukowe: gramatyka, semiotyka, semantyka, syntaktyka (H 352), literatura ogólna i porównawcza, krytyka literacka, teoria literatury (H 390).

Podstawowe języki: polski, litewski, angielski i rosyjski.

ONGOING ACADEMIC PUBLICATION

Published twice a year (April 25, October 25) by Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities and The Jan Kochanowski University Faculty of Humanities in Kielce.

Scientific field: philology (04H). Research areas: grammar, semantics, semiotics, syntax (H 352), general and comparative literature, literary criticism, literary theory (H 390).

The journal accepts articles and correspondence written in English, Lithuanian, Polish and Russian.

DUOMENŲ BAZĖS / BAZY DANYCH / ABSTRACTING AND INDEXING

Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek (2002) Arianta (2002)	Frei zugängliche E-Journals Universitätsbibliothek Regensburg
Balcan Rusistics (2004)	Naukowe i branżowe polskie czasopisma elektroniczne Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
C.E.E.O.L. (2005)	Russian Language, Literature and Cultural Studies Central and Eastern European Online Library DFG Nationallizenzen
EBSCO (2006)	Humanities International Complete Humanities Source Current Abstracts Humanities International Index TOC Premier
MLA (2007)	Modern Language Association International Bibliography
Index Copernicus (2008)	Index Copernicus International Journal Master List
Lituanistika (2011) Linguistic Bibliography Online (2012) Ulrichs (2013)	The database of the humanities and social sciences in Lithuania Brill Leiden, Netherlands Ulrich's Periodicals

PATIKRA / WERYFIKACJA / VERIFICATION



Redakcijos adresas / Adres redakcji / Address of the editorial board

Žurnalas „Respectus Philologicus“
Vilniaus universitetas
Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas
Muitinės g. 8, LT-44280 Kaunas, Lietuva

Respectus Philologicus
Vilnius University
Kaunas Faculty of Humanities
Muitines 8, Kaunas 44280, Lithuania

Tel. +370 37 750 536

El. paštas / E-mail respectus@gmail.com

Interneto svetainė / Strona internetowa / Homepage <http://filologija.vukhf.lt>

Moksliniai ir kalbos redaktoriai / Redakcja naukowa i językowa / Proof-readers

Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė (lietuvių kalba / język litewski / Lithuanian language)
Kazimierz Luciński, Beata Piasecka (lenkų kalba / język polski / Polish language)
Algis Braun (anglų kalba / język angielski / English language)
Eleonora Lassan, Viktorija Makarova (rusų kalba / język rosyjski / Russian language)

Vertimas / Tłumaczenie / Translation

Beata Piasecka, Živilė Nemickienė

Pagrindinė redaktorė / Redaktor prowadzący / Publishing editor

Viktorija Makarova

Print ISSN 1392-8295, Online ISSN 2335-2388

© Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas, 2014

© Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kielcach, 2014

REDAKTORIŲ KOLEGIJA — KOLEGIUM REDAKCYJNE

- Eleonora Lissan** VU KHF profesorė, habil. dr. (04H), Lietuva, *vyriausioji redaktorė*
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr hab. (04H), Litwa, *redaktor naczelny*
- Kazimierz Luciński** Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Lenkija, *vyriausiosios redaktorės pavaduotojas*
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab. (04H), Polska, *zastępcza redaktora naczelnego*
- Irina Oukhvanova-Shmygova** Baltarusijos valstybinio universiteto profesorė, dr. (04H), Baltarusija, *vyriausiosios redaktorės pavaduotoja*
 Profesor Białoruskiego Uniwersytetu Państwowego, dr (04H), Białoruś, *zastępcza redaktora naczelnego*
- Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė** VU KHF profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva, *atsakingoji sekretorė*
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa, *sekretarz kolegium*
- Daiva Aliūkaitė** VU KHF docentė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
 Docent Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa
- Danutė Balšaitytė** VU Užsienio kalbų instituto profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Instytut Języków Obcych, dr (04H), Litwa
- Wiesław Caban** Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr. (05H), Lenkija
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab. (05H), Polska
- Renato Corsetti** Romos universiteto „La Sapienza“ profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Italija
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Rzymskiego „La Sapienza“, dr hab. (04H), Włochy
- Anatolij Chudinov** Uralo valstybinio pedagoginio universiteto profesorius, dr. (04H), Rusija
 Profesor Uralskiego Państwowego Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego, dr (04H), Rosja
- Hans-Jürgen Diller** Bochumo Ruhro universiteto profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Vokietija
 Profesor Uniwersytetu Ruhry w Bochum, dr hab. (04H), Niemcy
- Aloyzas Gudavičius** Šiaulių universiteto profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Lietuva
 Profesor Uniwersytetu w Šiauliai, dr hab. (04H), Litwa

- Laima Kalėdienė** Lietuvių kalbos instituto vyriausioji mokslo darbuotoja, profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Starys pracownik naukowy, profesor w Instytucie Języka Litewskiego, dr (04H), Litwa
- Juris Kastinš** Latvijos universiteto profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Latvija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Łotewskiego w Rydze, dr hab. (04H), Łotwa
- Asta Kazlauskienė** Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Witolda Wielkiego, dr (04H), Litwa
- Jurij Kleiner** Sankt Peterburgo universiteto profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Rusija
Profesor Uniwersytetu w Sankt Petersburgu, dr hab. (04H), Rosja
- Aleksandras Krasnovas** VU KHF profesorius, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa
- Jadvyga Krūminienė** VU KHF profesorė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa
- Jurgita Mikelionienė** Kauno technologijos universiteto docentė, dr. (04H), Lietuva
Docent Uniwersytetu Technologicznego w Kownie, dr (04H), Litwa
- Gerald E. Mikkelson** Kanzaso universiteto profesorius, dr. (04H), JAV
Profesor Uniwersytetu w Kansas, dr (04H), USA
- Olegas Poliakovas** VU KHF profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie, dr hab. (04H), Litwa
- Marek Ruszkowski** Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr. (04H), Lenkija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab. (04H), Polska
- Yuri Stulov** Minsko valstybinio lingvistikos universiteto profesorius, dr. (04H), Europos „Amerikos studijų asociacijos“ Baltarusijos filialo prezidentas, Baltarusija
Profesor Państwowego Uniwersytetu Lingwistycznego w Mińsku, dr (04H), prezes białoruskiej filii Europejskiego Stowarzyszenia Studiów Amerykanistycznych, Białoruś
- Leona Tokor** Jeruzalės Žydų universiteto profesorė, habil. dr. (04H), Izraelis
Profesor Uniwersytetu Hebrajskiego w Jerozolimie, dr hab. (04H), Izrael

EDITORIAL BOARD

Eleonora Lissan	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania, <i>editor-in-chief</i>
Kazimierz Luciński	Professor (04H), The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland, <i>deputy editor-in-chief</i>
Irina Oukhvanova-Shmygova	Professor (04H), Belarusian State University, Belarus, <i>deputy editor-in-chief</i>
Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania, <i>managing secretary</i>
Daiva Aliūkaitė	Associate Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania
Danutė Balšaitytė	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Institute of Foreign Languages), Lithuania
Wiesław Caban	Professor (05H), The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland
Renato Corsetti	Professor (04H), Sapienza University of Rome, Italy
Anatolij Chudinov	Professor (04H), Ural State Pedagogical University, Russia
Hans-Jürgen Diller	Professor (04H), Ruhr University Bochum, Germany
Alozas Gudavičius	Professor (04H), Šiauliai University, Lithuania
Laima Kalėdienė	Professor (04H), Senior Researcher, Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Lithuania
Juris Kastinš	Professor (04H), University of Latvia, Latvia
Asta Kazlauskienė	Professor (04H), Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania
Jurij Kleiner	Professor (04H), St. Petersburg State University, Russia
Aleksandras Krasnovas	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania
Jadvyga Krūminienė	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania
Jurgita Mikelionienė	Associate Professor (04H), Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Gerald E. Mikkelson	Professor (04H), The University of Kansas, USA

Olegas Poliakovas	Professor (04H), Vilnius University (Kaunas Faculty of Humanities), Lithuania
Marek Ruskowski	Professor (04H), The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland
Yuri Stulov	Professor (04H), Minsk State Linguistic University, President of European Association for American Studies in Belarus, Belarus
Leona Toker	Professor (04H), The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

TURINYS / SPIS TREŚCI

I. PROBLEMOS IR SPRENDIMAI / PROBLEMY I ICH ROZWIĄZANIA

- Dušan Stamenković, Austin Bennett, Mihailo Antović** (Serbija, JAV / Serbia, USA). The Roles of Vision, Space, and the Body in Interpreting Unfamiliar Serbian and English Idiomatic Expressions 11
- Марина Гутовская** (Baltarusija / Białoruś). Фразеосемантическое поле в компаративном лингвокогнитивном освещении: направления и метод исследования 31
- Marek Ruszkowski** (Lenkija / Polska). Typy wariantywności w języku polskim 53

II. FAKTAI IR APMASTYMAI / FAKTY I ROZWAŻANIA

- Анастасия Беловодская** (Lietuva / Litwa). Сетевой фольклор и его роль в формировании коллективного когнитивного пространства 63
- Наталья Ковтун** (Rusija / Rosja). Прием художественной мистификации в романе К. Рансмайра «Последний мир» 74
- Michał Mazurkiewicz** (Lenkija / Polska). American Sport and the Sports Heroes of the Roaring Twenties 89
- Ecevit Bekler** (Turkija / Turcja). The True Face of Pre-Colonial Africa in *Things Fall Apart* 96
- Jane Mattisson** (Švedija / Szwecja). Supervising in English: The Doctoral Thesis, Professor/Student Discourse, and Social Practice 105
- Олег Гринбаум** (Rusija / Rosja). Вопросы теории стиха: эстетические категории и поэтический текст 118
- Piotr Zbróg** (Lenkija / Polska). Wpływ płynnej nowoczesności na kulturę języka w komunikacji profesjonalnej 140
- Joanna Szadura** (Lenkija / Polska). Konceptualizacja tygodnia we współczesnej polszczyźnie 149
- Dovilė Kulakauskienė** (Lietuva / Litwa). Atminties perėmimas ir tapatybės formavimas: kartų naratyvai Vilkyškių miestyje 160
- Simona Siderevičiūtė** (Lietuva / Litwa). Mokslinė fantastika istoriniame ir kultūriniame literatūros diskurse 172
- Oleg Leszczak** (Lenkija / Polska). Społeczny i empiryczny charakter transcendentalnego antropocentryzmu Immanuela Kanta: istota i lokalizacja tzw. „natury ludzkiej” 185
- Maryna Alohyna** (Ukraina / Ukraina). Comparative Analysis of the Reproduction of Style in Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish Translations of *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn* 200
- Tatiana Jankowska** (Lenkija / Polska). Między naturą a kulturą: analiza strukturalna mitu C. Lévi-Straussa w świetle współczesnej semiotyki 211

III. NUOMONĖ / OPINIE I POGLĄDY

- Казимеж Люцинский** (Lenkija / Polska). О заимствовании, отражающем практику современной действительности (к вопросу о слове *мониторинг* в русском языке в сравнении с польским)218

IV. SKAUDŪS KLAUSIMAI / DRAŹLIWE KWESTIE

- Audronė Rimkutė** (Lietuva / Litwa). „Pagarbaus atstumo“ principas lietuvos kultūros politikoje227

V. MŪSŲ VERTIMAI / NASZE PRZEKŁADY

- John R. Taylor** (Naujoji Zelandija / Nowa Zelandia). Kalba mąstyme. *Vertė / Tlum.* *Živilė Nemickienė*244

VI. MOKSLINIO GYVENIMO KRONIKA / KRONIKA ŻYCIA NAUKOWEGO

Knygų recenzijos / Recenzje książek

- Юрий Шатин** (Rusija / Rosja). Алгебра гармонии. ГРИНБАУМ, О. Н., 2012. *Роман А.С. Пушкина «Евгений Онегин»: ритмико-смысловый комментарий. Главы первая, вторая, третья, четвертая*; ГРИНБАУМ, О. Н., 2013. *Основы математико-гармонического анализа поэтических текстов*254

- Inesa Šeškauskienė** (Lietuva / Litwa). KESSLER, Stephan, 2013. *Theories of Metaphor Revised*259

- Julia Ostanina-Olszewska** (Lenkija / Polska). ŠEŠKAUSKIENĖ, Inesa, 2013. *Ways with Words: Insights into the English Lexicon and Some Cross-Linguistic Aspects of Study*...262

- Виктория Макарова** (Lietuva / Litwa). *La Table Ronde. Лингвистика дискурса и перспективы ее развития*. Выпуск 2. Сост. И. УХВАНОВА, А. КОЖИНОВА, Е. САВИЧ, 2013264

- Aleksandras Krasnovas** (Lietuva / Litwa). JURGUTIENĖ, Aušra, 2013. *Literatūros suvokimo menas. Hermeneutikos tradicija*.....266

- Anonsai / Zapowiedzi**270

VII. REIKALAVIMAI STRAIPSNIAMS /

- ZASADY OPRACOWYWANIA PUBLIKACJI272

- VIII. MŪSŲ AUTORIAI / NASI AUTORZY284

CONTENTS

I. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

Dušan Stamenković, Austin Bennett, Mihailo Antović (Serbia / USA). The Roles of Vision, Space, and the Body in Interpreting Unfamiliar Serbian and English Idiomatic Expressions.....	11
Marina Gutovskaya (Belarus). The Phraseological Semantic Field in a Contrastive Linguo-cognitive Study: Directions and Method of Research	31
Marek Ruskowski (Poland). Types of Variantivity in the Polish Language	53

II. FACTS AND REFLECTIONS

Anastasija Belovodskaja (Lithuania). Network Folklore and its Role in the Formation of a Collective Cognitive Space.....	63
Natalia Kovtun (Russia). The Method of Artistic Mystification in Ransmayr's Novel <i>The Last World</i>	74
Michał Mazurkiewicz (Poland). American Sport and the Sports Heroes of the Roaring Twenties	89
Ecevit Bekler (Turkey). The True Face of Pre-Colonial Africa in <i>Things Fall Apart</i>	96
Jane Mattisson (Sweden). Supervising in English: The Doctoral Thesis, Professor/Student Discourse, and Social Practice	105
Oleg Grinbaum (Russia). Issues of Verse Theory: Aesthetic Categories and the Poetic Text	118
Piotr Zbróg (Poland). Effects of Fluid Modernity on the Language Culture of Professional Communication	140
Joanna Szadura (Poland). The Conceptualization of a Week in the Contemporary Polish Language	149
Dovilė Kulakauskienė (Lithuania). Memory Passing and Identity Formation: Generational Narratives in Vilkyškiai	160
Simona Siderevičiūtė (Lithuania). Science Fiction in Historical and Cultural Literary Discourse	172
Oleg Leszczak (Poland). On the Social and Empirical Nature of Kant's Transcendental Anthropocentrism: The Essence and Location of "Human Nature". Part II	185
Maryna Alohyna (Ukraine). Comparative Analysis of the Reproduction of Style in Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish Translations of <i>Tom Sawyer</i> and <i>Huckleberry Finn</i>	200
Tatiana Jankowska (Poland). Between Nature and Culture: Lévi-Strauss's Structural Analysis of Myth in the Light of Semiotics	211

III. OPINION

- Kazimierz Luciński** (Poland). On the Process of Borrowing: A Comparative Analysis of the Use of *Monitoring* in Russian and Polish.....218

IV. SENSITIVE ISSUES

- Audronė Rimkutė** (Lithuania). The “Arm’s Length” Principle in Lithuanian Cultural Policy.....227

V. OUR TRANSLATIONS

- John R. Taylor** (New Zealand). *Kalba mąstyme / Language in the mind.* Translated by *Živilė Nemickienė*..... 244

VI. SCIENTIFIC LIFE CHRONICLE

Book reviews

- Yuri Shatin** (Russia). Алгебра гармонии. ГРИНБАУМ, О. Н., 2012. *Роман А.С. Пушкина «Евгений Онегин»: ритмико-смысловый комментарий. Главы первая, вторая, третья, четвертая;* ГРИНБАУМ, О. Н., 2013. *Основы математико-гармонического анализа поэтических текстов*254

- Inesa Šeškauskienė** (Lithuania). KESSLER, Stephan, 2013. *Theories of Metaphor Revised*.....259

- Julia Ostanina-Olszewska** (Poland). ŠEŠKAUSKIENĖ, Inesa, 2013. *Ways with Words: Insights into the English Lexicon and Some Cross-Linguistic Aspects of Study*262

- Viktorija Makarova** (Lithuania). *La Table Ronde. Лингвистика дискурса и перспективеее развития.* Выпуск 2. Сост. И. УХВАНОВА, А. КОЖИНОВА, Е. САВИЧ, 2013264

- Aleksandras Krasnovas** (Lithuania). JURGUTIENĖ, Aušra, 2013. *Literatūros suvokimo menas. Hermeneutikos tradicija*.....266

- Announcements** 270

- VII. REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLICATION** 272

- VIII. OUR AUTHORS** 284

Jane Mattisson*Kristianstad University**Faculty of Education and Environment**291 88 Kristianstad, Sweden**E-mail: jane.mattisson@hkr.se**Research interests: English Literature, text analysis, academic writing in English***SUPERVISING IN ENGLISH: THE DOCTORAL THESIS, PROFESSOR/STUDENT DISCOURSE, AND SOCIAL PRACTICE**

My article investigates the situation, goals, and discourse praxis of professors supervising doctoral students writing in English. It is part of a wider project examining student-teacher interaction which is designed to improve written communication, particularly at the higher levels of academic study. Like the students they supervise, the five professors studied are English as a Foreign Language users, and all give instruction exclusively in English. Based on separate interviews with each professor, my study demonstrates that there is a tendency among doctoral supervisors to focus on the content and form of the thesis to the detriment of socio-cultural practice, i.e., the discourse between the professor and student, as well as the recognition of the text as a piece of social practice, shaped by a particular kind of academic public and the rules of scholarship that have been developed over time. The type of social practice that students bring with them varies from culture to culture. I argue that a doctoral thesis bears witness not only to the student's ability to conduct research at a high level, but also to the creation of a distinct scholarly identity that is the result of effective discourse between professor and student, whereby the professor communicates "the rules of the game" that lead to a successful career both at university and after. My paper reflects on how we as teachers/supervisors can promote the formation of scholarly identity through the medium of English as a Foreign Language. I do so by focusing on the five supervisors' knowledge of English, their ability to provide guidance in English, and their awareness of the importance of promoting scholarly identity in English. The article concludes with some reflections on the type of support required, if any, from native English teachers.

KEY WORDS: doctoral thesis, discourse, socio-cultural practice, English as a Foreign Language, scholarly identity.

Introduction

There is a growing recognition among scholars that academic writing at all levels is as much a process as a product.¹ An important aspect of this process, particularly at the doctoral level, is how the supervisor can best facilitate the student's development of a scholarly identity through writing. Identity is understood here as a categorization of self

in relation to the wider community in which one works and to which one relates.² While there are numerous publications on academic writing in English, the doctoral thesis is a relatively neglected area; the many texts published about doctoral supervision, including many of the best-known, e.g., Bartlett

¹ See, for example, Mattisson (2012: 23–30).

² This definition of identity is widely recognized by social psychologists such as Stets and Burke (2000), as well as educational researchers such as Kamler and Thomson (2006).

and Mercer (2001), Delamont et al. (2000), Phillips and Pugh (1987), and Wisker (2004), devote surprisingly little attention to writing-centered supervision and frequently fail to address the creation of identity through the writing process. Most books on doctoral supervision also tend to focus on the student rather than on the supervisor.³ As Barbara Kamler and Pat Thomson (2006: 1) clearly demonstrate, however, “the issue of getting the dissertation written is as problematic for supervisors as it is for doctoral students.” Supervisors criticize students for turgid prose, poorly constructed arguments, and unfocused literature reviews that lack relevance to the argument. These problems are significantly enhanced where both the supervisor and the student are English as a Foreign Language (EFL) users.

Traditionally, the focus in doctoral supervision has been on writing up results and the quality of the final product, both in terms of content and structure, including its contribution to research in the field. The present paper, however, addresses the creation of identity in and through the writing process, focusing on how the supervisor can enable EFL students to project their personal view of reality through writing; this is part of the process of creating a scholarly identity that not only provides a firm basis for future work, but also enables the student to become a productive member of his/her scholarly community. It is assumed here that writing is not a reflection of something “out there,” but a creation of the individual, a combination of knowledge and experience which, in the case of the present study, is produced and presented in a language who-

se potential has neither been fully explored nor mastered by either supervisor or student.

The purpose of the study is to highlight the situation—one shared by many universities across Europe—at one medium-sized university in the south of Sweden. Of the eight professors contacted, only five were available for interview. All are experienced supervisors of EFL students, Swedish by birth, and represent different disciplines: pedagogy, genetic science, ecology, and public health. The interview questions were designed to act as a frame within which to discuss the supervisors’ different situations and views. They were not followed slavishly because the purpose was to enable each supervisor to reflect on their situation and the extent to which the language of supervision, English, furthers or hinders the promotion of scholarly identity among doctoral candidates who are not native speakers. The final question concerned possible forms of future support from the English Department. It should be emphasized, however, that it was not my assumption that the supervisors’ situation is necessarily problematical from a linguistic perspective.

The twelve issues discussed related to different aspects of the doctoral supervisors’ situation:

- 1) the extent of the supervisor’s doctoral supervision (main or assistant);
- 2) the nationality of the students supervised;
- 3) the supervisor’s perception of the importance of mastering the language contra the content of the thesis;
- 4) the supervisor’s awareness of the student’s previous experience of writing in English at a post-graduate level;
- 5) the extent to which the supervisor welcomes the opportunity to supervise in English;
- 6) whether he/she regards it as necessary

³ As Kamler and Thomson (2006: 1) note, “There are few places to which supervisors can refer for discussion specifically about doctoral writing, few places which might assist them to think differently about the textual practices of scholarship.”

to issue students with specific instructions/guidelines for writing a thesis in English and/or publishing in English in general;

7) the supervisor's perception of the nature of students' weaknesses and how he/she deals with them;

8) the supervisor's assessment of his/her own level of English;

9) situations which the supervisor regards as problematical in terms of his/her mastery of the English language;

10) the extent to which he/she collaborates with a native speaker in the writing process;

11) how to further scholarly identity in the writing process by focusing on the process as well as the product;

12) whether or not the supervisor sees a need for some kind of support from the English Department in terms of assisting students to write in English and/or in enabling them to develop their scholarly identity.

Method

As already established, the interview questions acted as a frame for the five interviews.⁴ All five were conducted between 5 and 19 November 2012, they took place in the supervisor's room at the university in order to put the interviewees at ease, and all five supervisors have read and approved publication of the present article. Four of the five supervisors were male. To safeguard the identities of the supervisors, the pronoun "he" is used throughout. All but one supervisor chose to answer my questions in English (one professor chose Swedish, arguing that he can express himself more efficiently in his native tongue). The interviews lasted between one and one

and a half hours; I took notes throughout. The supervisor was given time to elaborate at length on issues important to him/her; at the same time, I also ensured that all twelve interview areas outlined above were covered. My interview notes were transcribed on my computer directly after each interview and carefully edited.

Theory

Torrance and Thomas (1994) demonstrate that students who fail to complete their theses frequently do so as a result of writing-related issues. Failure to complete the thesis is particularly challenging where both supervisor and student are EFL users, because cultural issues and expectations as well as linguistic weaknesses may contribute to misunderstandings and significant delays in the writing process. As Kamler and Thomson (2006) note, universities are increasingly aware of the need to support supervisors in their work; however, the focus thus far has been on quality assurance and training, issues which are frequently addressed at workshops and in seminars. Supervisors are under increasing pressure to pass students and to provide a smooth passage from enrollment to graduation. The Swedish Higher Education Ordinance (*Högskoleförordningen* 2010) specifies that a doctoral student must be able to present and discuss his/her research in an authoritative manner in both national and international contexts, and in relation to the scientific community as well as society in general (Appendix 2).

Before this is possible, however, EFL users must first deal with more basic problems such as those encountered at the sentence and paragraph level; they may also, as Bitchener and Basturkmen demonstrate, find it particularly difficult to understand and meet the special characteristics and requirements of the thesis genre as defi-

⁴ For an in-depth discussion of qualitative research interview techniques, see Hatch (2002) and Richards et al. (2012).

ned by the host university (2006: 7). The literature review and discussion of results sections pose special problems, as they require a high level of thinking as well as language: if the language is weak, this restricts the student's ability to balance a range of ideas and results and to synthesize them into a discussion that adequately reflects the student's own thinking, which in turn leads to a lack of coherence and/or an authoritative voice (Kamler and Thomson 2006: Ch. 6–9).

Because a doctoral thesis is a social practice as defined by Lillis (2001),⁵ and is produced within a particular context, one cannot focus solely on skill deficits, spelling, grammar, punctuation, simplified models of text structure, or citation rules, but must also look at the wider context in which the supervisor and student are working.⁶ As already established, while there

⁵ Lillis (2001: 31) claims that “student writing takes place within a particular institution, which has a particular history, culture, values, practices. It involves a shift away from thinking of language or writing skills as individual possession, towards the notion of an individual in socially situated action; from an individual student having writing skills, to a student doing writing in specific contexts.”

⁶ See Lea and Street (2000), who argue for the importance of moving away from skills-based, deficit models of student writing in order to accommodate the more complex writing practices required at university level. See also Bazerman (1981, 1988) and Myers (1985), who explore rhetorical differences across academic disciplines. Bitchener and Basturkmen (2006) emphasize that while difficulties at sentence and paragraph level continue to be problematic for EFL learners writing a thesis in English, more emphasis needs to be placed on helping students to understand and meet the genre requirements of the thesis. They discuss a number of interesting studies of EFL users' problems in understanding how to organize ideas and construct arguments, how to use the appropriate style of writing, and how to express their thoughts clearly in English. See also Cooley and Lewkowicz (1995, 1997) and Dong (1998).

is a proliferation of books on supervision,⁷ few address writing-centered supervision. It appears, and perhaps not unexpectedly, that a greater awareness of the importance of context is evidenced in research on the supervision of EFL learners.⁸ However, such books tend to focus on the process of acculturation into a new academic and cultural community, rather than on the writing process as such.⁹

As Kamler and Thomson argue, supervisors often consider assistance with writing to be outside the supervisory relationship (2006: 10). My five interviews confirm that such is also the case at the Swedish university investigated. This is a significant problem, as an important aspect of the student's scholarly identity is thereby neglected. Indeed, texts are “an extension of the scholar, a putting of ‘self’ out there which is either successful or not” (Kamler and Thomson 2006: 15), as they are evaluated by peers as well as by examiners. Identity incorporates class, gender, race and ethnicity, dis/ability,

⁷ See, for example, Bartlett and Mercer (2001), Delamont et al. (1997), Phillips and Pugh (1987), and Wisker (2004). As Kamler and Thomson (2006) point out, writing as a social practice is largely ignored in such works. Indeed, writing is not even mentioned in the table of contents of any of these books.

⁸ Notable examples include Ballard (1996) Barker et al. (1991), Blue et al. (2000), and Lacina (2002).

⁹ See, for example, Hamp-Lyons (1991) and Johns (1993, 1995). One important exception is Paltridge and Starfield (2007), which contains a particularly useful section on Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusions. It provides useful tasks for supervisors when teaching structural norms and conventions, language patterns, and linguistic strategies. There is also an interesting discussion of issues around EFL students and qualitative research. At the end of the book, there is a briefly annotated, comprehensive list of resources, both online and print, that supervisors can draw on for further information and support.

age, location, and religion (Ibid.: 16–17). As Brodin emphasizes, without developing “scholarly identity in doctoral students, their chances of obtaining eulogized creativity in academia are not promising” (2011: 143). Scholarly identity and writing are all about gaining credibility in academia—and these go hand-in-hand.

Fairclough’s three dimensions of discourse

The three levels of discourse—i.e., “the way language is used”—outlined by Norman Fairclough (1992),¹⁰ namely text, discourse practice, and socio-cultural practice, provide a useful theoretical framework for the discussion of my interview results. At its most concrete level, the text (Fairclough’s first layer), is the spoken or written language used by both supervisor and student. It is also an instance of discourse practice (layer two), one that involves the production and interpretation of text. At its most abstract level, level three, the text is a piece of social practice, shaped by a particular kind of academic public and the rules of scholarship that have been developed over time. A number of these rules are unspoken. It is the supervisor’s task to ensure that the student is acquainted with all, or at least the most important of these. A summarized version of Fairclough’s model was presented to the supervisors in conjunction with question eleven on scholarly identity.

The five interviews: results and discussions

The interviews with the five professors focused primarily on student performance,

where the goal is to produce a doctoral thesis that will, at its very lowest level, fulfill the examiner’s basic requirements. The content, structure, and effectiveness of the thesis were emphasized by all five respondents. Although a number of the areas addressed in relation to the interview questions gave scope for discussion of the student’s scholarly identity and ability to perform well in a scholarly community, these were generally addressed by implication rather than explicitly. It was not until the eleventh question, which deals specifically with scholarly identity, that this aspect was brought into focus.

The supervisors interviewed have supervised between four and twelve doctoral students thus far, either as the main or assistant supervisor. All observed that where they have acted as assistant supervisor, they have to all intents and purposes functioned as the main supervisor. All students are/were EFL users. The total number of students supervised or currently being supervised is thirty-one, nineteen of whom are/were Swedish. The nationalities of the non-Swedish students include Argentinean, French, Indian, Jordanian, and Tanzanian. All of the theses were written in English except one, where the student chose to have his thesis translated from Swedish once it was completed (the supervisor stressed that he had “inherited” the student from another supervisor and would not have approved this procedure had he supervised the student from the very outset; he sees it as an important part of the student’s task at the doctoral level to write in English. One supervisor commented that he requires his Swedish students to write an article in Swedish for a popular journal before completing the thesis, as he regards this as “part of the student’s success story in the future.” En-

¹⁰ An excellent summary and evaluation of Fairclough’s model is to be found in Kamler and Thomson (2006: 19–23).

glish is reserved for the “more important” doctoral thesis.

Interestingly, no comments were made on how nationality and previous experience within a particular academic context might impinge on the quality of the thesis. One supervisor remarked that three of his Swedish students had worked in international environments but did not elaborate on how these might have influenced their perception of the task in hand or the way in which they should write their thesis.

With regard to the supervisor’s awareness of the student’s previous experience of writing in English at a post-graduate level, one supervisor observed that he normally recruits his students from among his Master’s students and is thus familiar with their ability to understand and write English. Another professor commented that he reviews the student’s Bachelor and Master’s theses and any articles they have written in English in order to assess linguistic competency. He gives preference to those who speak a third language as this, he claims, indicates linguistic ability and provides a wider potential for publications. One professor argued that the ability to write in English is not a criterion for selection of doctoral students in his department; potential students are required to write a reflection of their research career to date and elaborate on their experience of the areas specified in the advertisement for the specific position. This text is normally in Swedish (this professor has supervised Swedish students only). The quality of the Swedish is assessed on the assumption that it is an indication of the student’s linguistic sensitivity and capability; it is assumed that this naturally carries over into English. One professor argued that the student’s knowledge of subject content is more important than

his/her ability to communicate in English: “the language is only important when it affects meaning and logic.” On one occasion, however, he rejected an Arab student whose command of English was deemed inadequate. However, the fifth professor (whose students are drawn primarily from Jordan and Tanzania) argued as follows:

It is natural to discuss qualifications in English, and all of my Ph.D. students have provided me with their latest production in English, i.e., their Master’s thesis. Other relevant documents are a written personal letter focusing on the planned Ph.D. program and how they will use their new knowledge when returning to their home countries.

The final sentence is particularly significant with respect to the student’s identity as a scholar: scholarly knowledge should be of direct practical use to the home country. In discussing this statement, the professor observed that the student must be able not only to share his knowledge in terms of the results of his research, but also to do this in “adequate English.” He did not, however, define what he meant by “adequate” in the context of the home country; neither did he reflect on the extent to which standards might differ between the home and host country.

In terms of the professors’ attitudes to supervising in English, all five responded that it was a necessity that the student speak and write in English throughout if he/she is to be recognized internationally (the above-mentioned example of the student writing in Swedish and having his thesis translated into English is an exception). One professor commented that he actually prefers to supervise students in English, arguing that:

It is a fantastic opportunity for both the student and the supervisor to develop skills

in English, and the challenge is mutual, because we don't have English as our first language. Furthermore, when looking for relevant literature/references connected to the specific topic, the latest references are mostly in English.

Here, the professor is concerned with his own identity as both a supervisor and promoter of scholarly identity through writing. English is a means by which supervisor and student can, and indeed should, learn together.

When asked about the extent to which the supervisor issues instructions or guidelines for writing a thesis in English and for publishing in English in general, four of the professors claimed that this was not necessary: they expect the student to have a sufficiently high level of English from the outset, and the content is more important than the language. One exception, i.e., the abstract, was mentioned by the fifth professor. He "normally" helps the student to write it as it "represents another genre and needs specific instruction." This same problem is, of course, also shared by native speakers. For both kinds of English user, native and non-, the abstract is bound by expectations that are strictly regulated both culturally and academically. These expectations are not always clearly stipulated and vary from discipline to discipline, as well as from journal to journal. They are an important part of the "rules of the game" that the supervisor must teach his students.

There was one response regarding whether or not to issue instructions for writing in English that distinguished itself from all the others. Here the supervisor mentioned a number of guidelines he has compiled himself, which he presents in a "Short Introduction to PhD Studies; How to write scientific articles in English."

These include the following points: the importance of "clear, concise, and neutral" language, the "material is to be well researched," "appropriate theories should be used," the thesis should be "supported by relevant literature," and "all literature should be correctly acknowledged." While language is addressed in the first point, the focus is on the genre of the thesis itself. The assumption is that language is a necessary pre-condition for an acceptable thesis. However, it is not fully clear what is meant by "clear, concise, and neutral" language. The implication is that authority is produced by clarity, brevity, and neutrality. The style should be "non-personal" and "direct." Additional guidelines include: "if there is any uncertainty about a particular point, use cautious language such as 'may,' 'might,' 'could,' 'potentially';" and "unless you are a confident writer, it is best to avoid over-long sentences and aim for a mixture of long and short sentences for variation and rhythm." Students are also instructed to "avoid repeating the same words." With the exception of the final instruction regarding repetition, the guidelines relate to the student's validity as a scholar, focusing on his/her ability to defend results and to persuade. The professor reflected that national traditions vary greatly when it comes to writing scientific articles in English. It is thus necessary to provide students with specific, detailed guidelines from the very beginning.

With regard to the five supervisors' perceptions of student weaknesses in writing English, all emphasized faulty grammar and a tendency toward tautology, which make it difficult to follow the student's train of thought. One professor claimed:

An overarching concern is to avoid writing as they [the students] do in their first language: long sentences and many

subordinate clauses. This makes it difficult to follow the “red thread.” Furthermore, most of my international students have a tradition of writing a stipulated number of pages and they are more concerned about the quantity than the quality. Some texts are incredibly wordy.

This supervisor was the only one to point specifically to the influence of cultural background on the student’s written production. He was also the only one to address how he deals with problems related to different cultural backgrounds. His methods include the distribution of a number of well-written papers in which he points out where the author has expressed him-/herself particularly concisely, and where repetitions have been avoided by using such expressions as “as already established” and “as previously noted.”

When the supervisors were asked about whether they are ever concerned about the level of their English, one observed that he had lived in America for a couple of years and speaks and writes English almost like a native speaker—a fact that was clearly borne out during the interview. He did not, however, reflect on how his cultural experience might be of benefit to his students. The remaining four professors claimed that situations occasionally arise where they are unable to help students express themselves adequately in English due to their inability to explain grammatical rules or lack of vocabulary. One admitted that he would only tackle the most basic language problems, including concord or tense errors (the remainder, such as word choice and style, are left to the language corrector). Another stated that he has attempted to improve his English by attending university courses in academic writing in English, but admitted that his teaching schedule has precluded regular atten-

dance thus far. Another supervisor argued that he has no problems with academic style as this follows specific and well-established conventions, i.e., standard terminology and expressions that are familiar to all writers in the field. These are part of the “rules of the game” that he considers it his duty to share with his students.

One professor explained that he deals with language problems by discussing them with the student face-to-face, asking him/her to explain a particular sentence or comment. Together, they can usually work out an alternative version; he is, however, unsure if the alternative is correct from a linguistic or stylistic point of view, and is not always sure that the new version is a significant improvement on the original one. Where possible, he consults a native speaker. Significantly, no mention was made of the fact that a native speaker also possesses cultural knowledge that can be useful in determining the appropriateness of the revision in the specific context.

The question relating to situations that the supervisor regards as problematical in terms of his/her mastery of the English language was not specifically addressed in the interviews as it arose naturally in connection with the question relating to the professors’ perceptions of their level of English. All five professors maintained that their English is “adequate” for supervising doctoral students, but they chose not to go into detail regarding what constitutes “adequate” English. Significantly, the fact that the “adequacy” of a language is not merely related to accuracy and correctness, but also to audience and cultural expectations was not brought up by any of the professors.

With respect to working with native speakers, all five professors regarded such collaboration as advantageous, but differed

in their appraisal of the form(s) it should take. As discussed below, in relation to question twelve, the suggestions fell into two basic categories: language correction by a professional (two professors), and seminars to which other doctoral students, professors, and experts should be invited (three professors). Consulting a native speaker was described as “particularly important” where articles are to be submitted to British or American journals, as the language demands are “more stringent.” Interestingly, one professor remarked that “it does not matter if the language is imperfect if the student is submitting a text to a journal in a non-English speaking country; it only matters if you send to such countries as Britain, where the reviewers are much fussier.” This is perhaps questionable: one might equally well argue that accuracy of language is even more imperative where non-English readers are concerned, as there is a greater risk of misunderstanding; in addition, a British or American journal is often able to offer editing services. Significantly, the discussions focused on language issues rather than cultural ones: no professor, for example, chose to reflect on the specific cultural (national as well as academic) features of the English-speaking journals, and/or the problems their students might encounter in identifying and conforming to these.

The discussions stimulated by question eleven, concerning how to further scholarly identity through the writing process, were based on Fairclough’s definition of socio-cultural practice, i.e., the recognition of the text as a piece of social practice shaped by a particular kind of academic public and the rules of scholarship that have been developed over time. A summary of the model was presented at the beginning of the discussion of the question and was reviewed briefly

by myself. Three of the professors were already familiar with the model. The latter was not presented until question eleven because I wished to see if the professors would introduce the issue of social practice voluntarily. While all five professors acknowledged that assisting the development of scholarly identity among students is part of their responsibilities as supervisors, four out of five claimed that it is only a secondary function, since the focus must always be on the quality of the final product and “getting it accepted” by a journal. They argued that scholarly identity is something that “grows naturally out of the writing process.” When asked specifically *how* this process is stimulated and maintained, all four stated that it is important that students read scholarly articles from different journals and different cultural contexts in order to acquire the appropriate terminology and style. Such articles are rarely discussed with the supervisor, however, as the focus is usually on the student’s own text.

The fifth professor, whose students come primarily from Jordan and Tanzania, encourages students to read articles in English that are published in English- as well as non-English-speaking journals, including, where possible, journals from their own country. He discusses these articles with his students with a view to establishing the distinguishing characteristics of the different journals. This is not only to ensure correct or appropriate use of language, but also to enable the students to “situate” themselves in their home country and its cultural and, more particularly, scholarly traditions. In this way, the professor hopes that his students will be able to make significant scientific contributions to their own culture and country. The more different the culture, the greater the importance of this aim, he argues.

Finally, with respect to the twelfth question regarding whether the professors perceive a need for some kind of support from the English Department, two practical solutions were, as already established, proposed: language correction by a professional language corrector, and seminars in which students' work is discussed. Language correction and proof-reading of scripts is done primarily by the supervisor, except in the case of one professor, who recommends his students to send their complete thesis to a professional proofreader before the public defense. This system is also used occasionally by one other professor, where problems of language and style are of such a nature that he feels unable to correct them adequately himself. Significantly, no professor specifically mentioned the importance of cultural knowledge when language-correcting a script—tone and style varying considerably, for example, between British and American journals.

The possibility of including a native speaker in seminar discussions of student texts was discussed in detail. Three of the professors claimed that this would be an excellent complement to the supervisor's proofreading of the thesis. Two of the three professors argued specifically for the presence at seminars of a native English speaker as opposed to a non-native EFL teacher, suggesting that the native speaker is more sensitive to cultural influences and potential sources of misunderstanding. Three professors suggested that the presence of a native speaker at seminars would also promote discussion of social practice issues by considering to what extent the text is adapted to a particular kind of academic reader and culture. It was also proposed by one professor that the discussion include rules of scholarship and the extent to which these

have been adapted to the particular academic culture and requirements of the journal to which the article will be submitted.

It can be mentioned that since completing the present study, the writer has attended three doctoral seminars in the genetic science department. This is a system that arose as a direct consequence of my study and is soon to be implemented in other research areas. During the seminars, student texts are discussed in detail and in the presence of not only the writer but the supervisor, other experts within the field, and doctoral students. I receive the texts in advance, suggest revisions and possible areas of misunderstanding, and pinpoint issues that need to be discussed both from a linguistic and a cultural perspective. In this way, students' scholarly identity is strengthened both in terms of subject expertise and linguistic competence.

Conclusions

While my study is limited in scope, the five interviews nonetheless point clearly to a tendency among doctoral supervisors to underestimate the importance of the creation of scholarly identity through writing in favor of a focus on the content and language of the doctoral thesis. The discussions with the five professors revolved around all three layers of Fairclough's model: the text (layer one), discourse practice (layer two), and "socio-cultural practice" (layer three). As already established, student identity is produced primarily in and through the writing of the doctoral thesis. For this process to be efficient, it is necessary to bring the "socio-cultural practice" element to the fore, both in terms of the student's previous experience and expectations, as well as with regard to the hidden rules of the academic

game, including the politics of particular institutions and disciplines; these must be mastered if the EFL user is not only to achieve success within the system, but also to function independently and effectively as a member of his/her chosen scholarly community.

It is the third layer of Fairclough's model that is most problematical, because it is less visible and because it requires considerable knowledge on the part of the supervisor, who must know well both his subject and the environment and context from which his/her student comes. More research needs to be conducted into how the doctoral student's home culture—national as well as academic—influences his/her perception of the nature and purpose of doctoral supervision and the production of the doctoral thesis itself. How does the student's culture affect his/her understanding of the relationship between student and supervisor? How does a doctoral student

learn the rules of scholarship in a new country? What is the role of the supervisor in explaining these rules? Where such rules are unspoken, how are they best communicated to the doctoral student? How can/should the supervisor prepare a doctoral student for active participation in a community of practice of which the student has little or no previous experience?

The creation and strengthening of scholarly identity is crucial at the doctoral level. This identity is never individual, it is plural; it is never fixed, but is always in a process of being formed; it is continually made and re-made in and as action, and it is discursively formed. It is thus not only the final product that is important, but the process by which it has been achieved. Nowhere is scholarly identity more important than in the doctoral thesis, which is, after all, the start of what will, hopefully, be a long and fruitful career as a scholar.

References

BALLARD, B., 1996. Through language to learning: preparing overseas students for study in Western universities. In: H. COLEMAN, ed., *Society and the Language Classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 148–169.

BARKER, M, CHILD, C., GALLOIS, C., JONES, E., CALLAN, V., 1991. Difficulties of Overseas Students in Social and Academic Situations. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 43, 79–84.

BARTLETT, A., MERCER, G., 2001. *Postgraduate Research Supervision: Transforming Relations*. New York: Peter Lang.

BAZERMAN, C., 1981. What Written Knowledge Does: Three Examples of Academic Discourse. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 11(3), 361–387.

BAZERMAN, C., 1988. *Shaping Written Knowledge*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

BITCHENER, J., BASTURMEN, H., 2006. Perceptions of the Difficulties of Postgraduate L2 Thesis Students Writing the Discussion Section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5, 4–18.

BLUE, G., MILTON, J., SAVILLE, J., eds., 2000. *Assessing English for Academic Purposes*. Bern, Germany: Peter Lang.

BRODIN, E., 2011. Research and Theory. Conceptualizing and Encouraging Critical Creativity in Doctoral Education. *International Journal for Researcher Development*, 2, 133–151.

COOLEY, L., LEWKOWICH, J., 1995. The Writing Needs of Graduate Students at the University of Hong Kong: A Project Report. *Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 18, 121–123.

COOLEY, L., LEWKOWICH, J., 1997. Developing Awareness of the Rhetorical and Linguistic Conventions of Writing a Thesis in English: Addressing the Needs of ESL/EFL Postgraduate Students. In: A. DUSZAK, ed., *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 113–140.

DELAMONT, S., ATKINSON, P., PARRY, O., 2000. *The Doctoral Experience: Success and Failure in Graduate School*. London: Falmer Press.

DONG, Y., 1998. Non-native Graduate Students' Thesis/Dissertation Writing in Science: Self-reports by Students and Their Advisors from Two US Institutions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17, 369–390.

FAIRCLOUGH, N., 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. London: Polity.

HAMP-LYONS, L., ed., 1991. *Assessing Second Language Writing in Academic Contexts*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

HATCH, A., 2002. *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. New York: State University of New York.

HÖGSKEFORDNINGEN, 2010. SFS 1993:100, with revisions to SFS 1010:1064. Stockholm: Utbildnings-departementet. Appendix 2.

JOHNS, A., 1993. Written Argumentation for Real Audiences: Suggestions for Teacher Research and Classroom Practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 75–90.

JOHNS, A., 1995. Teaching Classroom and Authentic Genres: Initiating Students into Academic Cultures and Discourses. In: D. BELCHER and G. BRAINE, eds., *Academic Writing in a Second Language*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 277–291.

KAMLER, B., THOMSON, P., 2006. *Helping Doctoral Students Write. Pedagogies for Supervision*. London and New York: Routledge.

LACINA, J., 2002. Preparing International Students for a Successful Social Experience in Higher Education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 117, 21–327.

Jane Mattisson

Kristianstado universitetas, Švedija

Moksliniai interesai: anglų literatūra, teksto analizė, akademinis rašymas anglų kalba

VADOVAVIMAS ANGLŲ KALBA: DAKTARO DISERTACIJA, PROFESORIAUS / STUDENTO DISKURSAS IR SOCIALINIAI ĮPROČIAI

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos profesorių, vadovaujančių doktorantams, rašantiems anglų kalba, situacijos, tikslai ir diskurso praktika. Tai didesnio projekto dalis, skirta tirti studento ir dėstytojo bendravimą bei pagerinti rašytinę komunikaciją, ypač aukštesniame akademinį studijų lygįje. Penki profesoriai ir jų vadovaujami studentai yra anglų kaip antrosios kalbos vartotojai ir bendrauja tik anglų

LEA, M. R., STREET, B., 2000. Student Writing and Staff Feedback in Higher Education: An Academic Literacies Approach. In: M. R. LEA, B. STIERER, eds., *Student Writing in Higher Education. New Contexts*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 32–46.

LILLIS, T., 2001. *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, Desire*. London and New York: Routledge.

MYERS, G., 1985. The Social Construction of Two Biologists' Proposals. *Written Communication*, 2(3), 219–455.

PALTRIDGE, B., STARFIELD, S., 2007. *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A Handbook for Supervisors*. London: Routledge.

PHILLIPS, E., PUGH, D. S., 1987. *How To Get a PhD: A Handbook for Students and Their Supervisors*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

RICHARDS, K., ROSS, S. J., SEEDHOUSE, P., 2011. *Research Methods for Applied Language Studies. An Advanced Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.

STETS, J. E., BURKE, P., 2000. Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63:3, 224–237.

TORRANCE, M., THOMAS, G., 1994. The Development of Writing Skills in Doctoral Research Students. In: R. G. BURGESS, ed., *Postgraduate Education and Training in the Social Sciences*. London: Jessica Kingsley, 105–124.

WISKER, G., 2004. *Writing Up Qualitative Research*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jane Mattisson

Uniwersytet w Kristianstad, Szwecja

Zainteresowania naukowe: literatura angielska, analiza tekstu, pisanie prac naukowych w języku angielskim

PROMOTORSTWO W JĘZYKU ANGIELSKIM: PRACA DOKTORSKA, DYSKURS PROFESOR–STUDENT A PRAKTYKA SPOŁECZNA

Streszczenie

Artykuł omawia sytuację, cele i praktykę dyskursu profesorów kierujących pracami doktorantów piszących w języku angielskim. Badanie stanowi część większego projektu dotyczącego analizy relacji student-wykładowca i ukierunkowanego na doskonalenie komunikacji pisanej, zwłaszcza na wyższym poziomie studiów akade-

kalba. Remiantis individualiais interviu su dėstytojais, nustatyta, kad tarp doktorantų mokslinių vadovų vyrauja tendencija sutelkti dėmesį į disertacijos turinį ir formą, antrame plane paliekant sociokultūrinę patirtį, t.y. diskursą tarp profesoriaus ir studento.

Tekstą pripažinus socialinių įpročių dalimi, susiformavo tam tikras akademinės visuomenės tipas ir taisyklės stipendijoms gauti, kurios ilgainiui buvo tobulinamos. Studentų socialiniai įpročiai susiję su jų gimtąja kultūra. Teigtina, kad daktaro disertacija liudija ne tik studento gebėjimą atlikti aukšto lygio mokslinius tyrimus, bet ir rodo jo individualios mokslinės tapatybės formavimąsi, žymintį veiksmingą diskursą tarp profesoriaus ir studento, kai profesorius komunikuoja „žaidimo taisyklės“, ir kurios, savo ruožtu, veda į sėkmingą karjerą tiek universitete, tiek jį baigus. Straipsnyje svarstoma, kaip mokytojai, vadovai galėtų skatinti mokslinio identiteto formavimąsi anglų kaip antrosios kalbos terpėje. Autorė sutelkia dėmesį į penkias vadovo anglų kalbos žinių sritis, gebėjimą teikti konsultacijas anglų kalba ir mokslinio identiteto anglų kalba formuosenos skatinimą. Straipsnio pabaigoje pateikiami apmąstymai apie paramą, kurios gali prireikti kreipiantis pagalbos į gimtakalbį anglų kalbos mokytoją.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: disertacija, diskursas, socialiniai-kultūriniai ypatumai, anglų kaip antroji kalba, mokslinė tapatybė.

mickich. Pięciu profesorów, podobnie jak ich doktoranci, jest użytkownikami języka angielskiego jako drugiego i wszelkich wskazówek udzielają oni swoim studentom wyłącznie w języku angielskim. Na podstawie wywiadów przeprowadzonych osobno z każdym wykładowcą stwierdzono, że promotorzy mają tendencję do skupiania uwagi na treści i formie rozprawy ze szkodą dla praktyk społeczno-kulturowych, tj. dyskurs między profesorem a studentem, podobnie jak uznanie tekstu za część praktyki społecznej, jest ukształtowany przez określony typ społeczności akademickiej oraz system stypendialny, który z biegiem czasu został rozbudowany. Typ praktyki społecznej, jaki przynoszą ze sobą studenci, różni się w zależności od kultury. Autorka twierdzi, że praca doktorska nie tylko dowodzi umiejętności prowadzenia przez studenta badań na wysokim poziomie, ale też świadczy o kształtowaniu się jego odrębnej tożsamości naukowej, która jest wynikiem efektywnego dyskursu między profesorem a studentem, gdzie profesor komunikuje „zasady gry”, umożliwiającą pomyślną karierę zarówno na uniwersytecie, jak i poza nim. Przedstawiono rozważania dotyczące sposobów kształtowania przez promotorów tożsamości naukowej doktorantów za pośrednictwem języka angielskiego jako drugiego, skupiając uwagę na stopniu znajomości języka angielskiego pięciu promotorów, ich umiejętności udzielania wskazówek w języku angielskim oraz uświadamiania sobie znaczenia kształtowania tożsamości naukowej w języku angielskim. We wnioskach przedstawiono rozważania na temat ewentualnych form pomocy ze strony wykładowców, dla których angielski jest językiem ojczystym.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: doktorat, dyskurs, praktyki społeczno-kulturowe, angielski jako drugi język, tożsamość naukowa.

Gauta 2013 12 30

Priimta publikuoti 2014 01 24