L1 LITERACY IN KAZAKHSTAN AND ITS EFFECT ON L2 ENGLISH ACADEMIC LITERACY

Dr. K.K. Dimitriou

KIMEP University, 2 Abay Avenue, Almaty, Kazakhstan

k.dimitriou@kimep.kz

Darina Omurzakova

KIMEP University, 2 Abay Avenue, Almaty, Kazakhstan

d.omurzakova@kimep.kz

Karina Narymbetova

KIMEP University, 2 Abay Avenue, Almaty, Kazakhstan

n.karina@kimep.kz

Abstract

As foreign language universities are becoming ever-more common, the issue of second-language tertiary literacy has come to the forefront. The linguistic demands of such universities on new students are very challenging. Though freshmen can pass international language exams in English, the literacy skills that are most important to tertiary success are those developed in their first language. However, it is becoming more widely known that most Central Asian post-Soviet education systems do little to develop such literacy. It would be of great interest to understand the experiences of students who were going through this difficult tertiary literacy process. Our exploratory ethnographic study investigated students' linguistic and schooling backgrounds, their development of writing skills, and their literacy metalanguage, to try and ascertain the effect of their first-language literacy on their progress. Therefore, we investigated a Foundation level English-language writing class, the experiences of its teacher, and six of its students, in a Kazakhstan university. Our findings show that literacy practices in the high schools of Central Asia seem to be deficient both in the quality of literacy teaching and in the culture of literacy, namely critical thinking and metacognition. These have had demonstrable effects on students' literacy acquisition.

Keywords: L1 Literacy, L2-English Academic Literacy, Metalanguage, Argumentation, CEFR.

Manuscript:

1 Introduction and context

Tertiary education is built upon advanced literacy skills. When these advanced skills are practiced in an Anglophone university in Central Asia, the language may be foreign, but the literacy skills may be too abstract. Therefore, it is the role of university literacy teachers to work on raising students' standards (Jones, Turner, & Street, 1999). This work can be done more successfully if students' literacy foundations are known. That is the purpose of this study, which tries to explain the relationship between L1 literacy foundations and their effect on L2 tertiary literacy. The authors' university is an American liberal arts-style college which conducts most of its lessons in English. It has Foundation- level courses to bring potential students literacy up to the entry requirements, through a literacy program. It is this program and its students that are the object of an exploratory ethnographic study of students' background and literacy metacognition.

1.1 Literacy and the transition to university

Entry is typically gained to an Anglophone university through the well-known international examinations, chief of which are IELTS and TOEFL, which test the four skills. Universities usually enroll those who have reached B1 level on the CEFR scale, the implication being that such students should be capable of studying in English. Despite the belief that many universities have in the examinations, these tests are not tests of tertiary literacy and do not reflect tertiary writing requirements (Ryan & Viete, 2009; Neff, 2013). It is then incumbent upon an institution to interpret students' scores and decide for themselves which students they will accept. Often this means students completing a semester or more of Foundation training. Being that the test is in a foreign language, their L2, means that their L2-English studies will mostly be built upon the foundations of their first- language education.

Naturally, tertiary literacy is considerably more complex than the demands of any high school program. Nobody arrives at university conversant in Academic English (Bourdieu & Passeron 1994: 8). Universities take in freshmen, and challenge those students to build up their writing skills to the required standard. Success at this is made more likely if the students' high schools prepared them by laying a foundation of in-depth reading and writing, including source use (Sharp, 2010; Keck, 2014), and perhaps experience of citation (Friedman, 2019), which seems to be common in Anglophone education systems. It is unfortunate that some school systems do not provide such opportunities (Hayes & Introna, 2005).

Indeed, L1 school systems come into focus because of the popularity of Anglophone universities for L2- English students. It is important to know the degree to which L1 education can prepare students for university, as regards cognitive ability, abstraction and literacy. One aspect of it is cultural awareness, which can have an effect on students' success (Cai & Kunnan, 2019). The L1 cognitive work in high school should develop students' capabilities with abstract topics and abstraction (as found in Cummins' BICS/CALP Quadrant 4 -Roessingh, 2006), which develop through structured reading, writing and debates about important issues, while in high school.

Another, even more important aspect is the prior literacy groundwork they bring with them, as students attempt to learn in another language and education system with its own cultural history. L2-English students enter this system with a much smaller vocabulary than native speakers and less experience of English literacy. Therefore, it is important to see what role literacy background plays in a student's literacy process at an Anglophone university. Timm (2008) has found that pre-university literacy in Europe is often lacking in depth, leaving students deficient in critical thinking skills also (Neff, 2013). Even British high school graduates, though they are aware of the complexity of university writing, still may lack a sense for what they are (Andrews, 2010). As a result, they will often use familiar patterns of writing

from their secondary work (Andrews, Torgerson, Low, McQuinn, & Robinson, 2006 in Neff, 2013).

The utility of L1 literacy skills may be somewhat indirect, as different languages can have very different rhetorical styles and genres, as has been posited by contrastive rhetoric (Kaplan, 1966). The foundations are what create the unconscious writing habits and routines that students use instinctually, when faced with a literacy challenge (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008). Nevertheless, students' literacy foundations could be utilised in the process of mastering L2 academic writing (Kirkpatrick, 2017; Cummins, 2016).

This has hastened the discovery of the role of explicit literacy metacognition in L2 writing (Negretti, 2012). Students are aided by raising their awareness of the genres of English writing, and their component parts (Wei & Zhang, 2020). An explicit awareness means that students can, through writing practice, reflect on their own writing and thus write more independently (Anderson, 2007), which is one goal of the Foundation program at KIMEP. However, if students don't have an awareness of, or even experience of literacy in their L1 schooling, then their work of L2 literacy acquisition will be more difficult, and it could even frustrate any progress.

Issues like these are the reason why L2 students' literacy processes are so important. It is clear that their literacy needs are different from those of L1 English students (Hirvela, 2017). Meanwhile, the literacy expectations for both groups are the same- argumentation, supporting evidence, an understanding of topic, drawing conclusions.

The needed for writing classes with literacy experts derives partly from the fact that lecturers do not see literacy as their primary function when teaching (Neff, 2013). Secondly, the standard teaching materials in language support classes is too general and superficial for the needs of university students. Thirdly, the writing skills demanded in the standard

international exams (e.g. IELTS) do not map well onto the literacy required at university (Neff, 2013).

1.2 Studying Tertiary L2-English writing

As academic literacy is communicative writing for an audience, and because the CEFR (COE, 2001) is a set of standards for communicative language use, Neff (2103) created a set of descriptors for academic writing. She created a schema of argumentation to the relevant CEFR levels, B1 to C2. The main components were "claims and supporting evidence, counter-arguments and qualifiers, and hedging" (Neff, 2013). These could prove valuable not only for assessment of students' writing, but also for pedagogy and for creating a syllabus for university literacy classes.

1.3 The Education System in Kazakhstan

This section will investigate the relevant aspects of the education system in Kazakhstan. The first indication of a deficiency in education is derived from common international tests that countries participate in. The first is the PISA 2012 reading test in which Kazakhstani students faired relatively poorly particularly in reading, between 2009 and 2012 (OECD, 2018). One of the reasons for this is perhaps due to the centralised education system in the country which does not allow local initiatives. The pedagogical approach to education, as evidenced by the Ministry guidelines is competence-based, where outcomes take precedent. This makes for objective testing that doesn't leave room for student creativity or expression.

In particular, the literacy foundations are laid out in the Ministry guidelines (NAO, 2015a, b), in the curriculums for both Russian-language and Kazakh- language schools. They have a set of Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO) that include creating different types of texts, synthesizing information from written and oral texts, writing essays, articles, letters, analyzing and evaluating information, and revising and editing texts. Their ILOs for foreign language teaching include filling in tables, charts, questionnaires or surveys, describing real or imaginary

events, writing paragraphs, and texts of various genres, then editing and proofreading of texts. These curriculums have been judged "excessively theoretical, wide and superficial" by the OECD (2018).

These goals seem to be worthy, as far as they go. However, schools are forced to make curriculums work within this framework, taking into consideration their local capabilities. It is the post-soviet curriculums that Yassukova (2020) blames for most of the deficiencies in education. However, there are other, more practical factors to consider.

Teachers can often have classes of more than 50 children. The logistics of such a task make the teacher's job very difficult, coupled with the great amount of bureaucratic work that teachers have. Therefore, their testing is very much objective and focused on accuracy, rather than creative, communicative writing. There is ample anecdotal evidence that schools gave writing assignments to students, but accepted, or even encouraged, students to cut and paste items from Internet sources for those assignments. The data from our participants, in this study, will corroborate much of the information above, as regards the literacy experiences in Kazakhstani high schools.

The educational environment exists within a societal context. In Kazakhstan, that societal context is one of the culturally-conditioned authoritative upbringing of children. If one looks at Hofstede's (2011) research, Post-soviet cultures, including Kazakhstani culture in particular can be referred to as a collectivist, large power distance society. In such societies, opinions are predetermined by the group, and parents or elders teach children obedience. Subordinates expect to be told what to do, and there is general conformity with the opinions of the group, and discouragement of behaviour which does not fit the norm. This may be the cause of the attrition of teenagers' ability to express their opinion and logically reason it out through the use of argumentation.

That societal context does affect the teaching culture. Yassukova (2020), a Russian psychologist, studied almost 5 000 9th -graders over 2 decades. She claims that the school curriculum is not capable of building and reinforcing academic types of thinking, such as the ability to logically systematise information. Such thinking is precisely what would be required as a foundation for argumentative thinking and writing at university.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Objectives

In light of the task of teaching tertiary English literacy to graduates of the Kazakhstani education system, it is important to verify the role played by the educational system in students' literacy development up to and including high school, and also understand the effect of this development on students' tertiary literacy and literacy metacognition. As this had never been done before, we conducted an exploratory ethnographic study of a Foundation Level A (FA henceforth- the top Foundation level course) course at the authors' university, which met daily, over the length of one semester, in 2019, investigating the effect of students' literacy background on their FA writing and their metacognition.

The first goal was to capture students' experiences in high school and during the FA course. This was done through questionnaires from, and interviews of the students. The questionnaires, on issues of literacy background, were collected in the first weeks of the course, on Google Forms. These were the basis for the interviews that occurred after the end of the semester, and which also covered issues of metalanguage awareness. All the interviews were conducted via Zoom, in English and Russian, by two of the authors, and transcribed and translated by those same authors. These ethnographic data were triangulated with the teacher's journal.

Students' writing was assessed for aspects of argumentation, at three distinct stages during their course. During the data collection phase, a quarantine was imposed on the country

due to the pandemic of COVID-19. That resulted in the Foundation course transferring to the online mode of teaching and learning. Some writing data was therefore collected during face-to-face study and other writing data were in electronic format, having been submitted to the university's LMS, where students submitted their assignments.

2.2 Participants

Six FA students (out of a class of 14, taught by one author) consented to take part in the research, five Kazakhstani and one Tajik (five females and one male), all of whom were first-year students of KIMEP University, in their second semester of an Undergraduate Foundation course, where their FA course had been preceded by the Foundation B course (narrative writing). The five Kazakhstani participants represented different parts of the country: West, East, South and local to Almaty. Their ages at the beginning of the data collection ranged from 17 to 21. Their academic background included two lyceum graduates (a higher status and quality than common secondary schools), one of them being the Tajik students, and the rest of the participants were graduates of common secondary schools. Three students had finished Kazakh-medium school, two of them were from Russian- medium schools, and one was from a Tajik-medium school.

2.3 Textual analysis

The argumentation analysis is based on the system created by Neff (2013) with a few variations designed for the uses of this study, based on the methods of teaching at the university. Their claim resolution involved their ability to make a claim, as the overall essay thesis. But for it to be considered resolved, it needed to be coupled with a conclusion and sub-claims (at the paragraph level). Next, there were two levels of argumentation, pro-con and argument/counter-argument. The argument/ counterargument structure is the required university-level argumentation needed for undergraduate studies. Thirdly, there were the

analytic components of argumentation. Those components were reasons and evidence. The latter type, cited and sourced evidence, is required for university- level analysis.

3 Results

3.1 Interviews & questionnaires with students

The first issue was the participants' literacy background in their L1. About half of the respondents recall writing opinion essays in their L1 that were based on literature readings, ranging in length from 200 to 1000 words. There are indications that the quality of these tasks was very low, perhaps having little or no structure, other than a perfunctory introduction and conclusion, and a middle section, while there was a general allowing of copying from the Internet. This data show a weak foundation in L1 literacy, both in amount written and depth of reading analysis.

The group's L2- English literacy experience varied widely. The majority of respondents had experience of writing essays in English, in school, though only one (Tajik), had been given lessons on how to write. The essays tended to be either opinion or narrative essays, with a similar lack of quality control (no introductions, no topics, copying from the Internet) being common. Also, all but one of the respondents had participated in private classroom-based English lessons, outside of school which averaged between two and four hours per week, for at least one year. These lessons did not add much to the participants' literacy skills. Indeed, the reason that these students had attended outside classes is that the English classes at their high schools were not felt to be sufficient for them to gain a good grasp of English. This data show a very weak foundation in structured writing, and in holistic literacy including the study of reading source texts.

Since metacognition of literacy is seen as a necessary component of independent writing, this issue was also investigated, using prompts to gather participants' impressions. The main literacy items recalled by the majority were thesis statements, topic sentences, and the

use of credible sources. The role of credible sources was very well-understood indeed, as regards what constituted a credible source, and what its purpose was within the essay. A sufficient depth of knowledge about the other items was not always evident. The respondents were able to locate the placement of the thesis statement in the introduction, but only two were able to recall what the purpose of the thesis statement was, that being to state the writer's opinion on the topic of the essay. The function of topic sentences was not well understood, as only one respondent offered a relevant explanation, but even that understanding was merely regarding its placement. These data indicate that the participants' metalanguage was still weak, even after the semester-long FA course.

The participants' meta-awareness of their Foundation course was broadly positive. There was broad awareness of the need for their course, and that its purpose was to improve their essay literacy for their undergraduate courses that were to follow. The respondents all tended to have a broad range of thoughts about benefits of, and purposes of the FA course. However, they all centred around relevant aspects of tertiary literacy, writing essays and the relevant writing skills, academic language, paraphrasing and structure. Respondents showed that they understood the difference between their FA writing course and their previous, high school literacy. The most common benefit of the FA course, vis-à-vis their L1 experience, was the structure of writing, and the need for an essay introduction with a general topic. The respondents all found the FA course helpful, since it was preparing them for their later courses, and the writing skills that they would require. This indicates that the Foundation program was both beneficial and found to be beneficial by the students.

3.2 Students' writing

The students' progress in the course was examined through a study of their writing at three stages in their semester-long course, that correspond roughly to the beginning, middle and end of the program. The focus of the analysis was on the construction of argumentation, as

this is the type of writing that is required in Anglophone university Humanities and Social Science courses. We used a variation on Neff's (2013) argumentation analysis.

In the first analysis (Table 1), we looked at students' production of the main claim, or thesis of an essay, and whether it was clear, and coupled with a clear conclusion and sub-claims. In the first stage, the students had only written an elaborated paragraph, and thus their writing had a thesis and a conclusion, but lacked sub-claims at the paragraph level (0%). At the second stage, most of the participants were able to produce a complete argumentation structure (80%). By the final stage, all the writers had apparently acquired this aspect of writing (100%). This indicates that the participants were able to develop this structure through the support given during their course.

The second element of the analysis (Table 1) was the use of complex argumentation in the macro structure of the text, and within paragraph structures. This aspect refers to whether students can balance an argument between two competing claims (Reid, 1999), of which there are two types. At stage 1, the simple presentation of a pro and con argument, with no argumentation, was not evident at all (0%). By stages two and three, they students had become quite proficient at this type of writing (100% and 80% respectively).

Stage	1	2	3
Claim & resolution	0%	80%	100%
Pro/con arg.	0%	100%	80%
Arg/counter arg.	0%	0%	20%

Table 1 Argumentation components (n=5)

Regarding the argument/ counter-argument type of writing, there was little evidence visible from their writing. At stages one and two, there were no examples. By stage three, one

student was capable of presenting two conflicting claims successfully, and choosing and supporting one of the claims.

The third element, that of analysis (Table 2), was indicated by the use of reasoning and evidence within argumentative paragraph structures. Again, there were two levels of capability discerned. As regards reasoning, or presenting reasons for a sub-claim at the paragraph level, there was ample proof. From stage 1, all participants could produce effective reasons for their claims. When it came to supporting sub-claims at the paragraph level, there was no evidence of this, at stage one (0%). However, by stages two and three, there was complete coverage (100%). This means that the participants had learned the basic rhetorical structuring of an argumentative paragraph.

Stage	1	2	3
Relevant reasons	80%	80%	100%
Sub-claim reasons	0%	100%	100%
Sourced evidence	0%	0%	0%

Table 2 Analysis components (n=5)

The next level of analysis that was expected was the development of evidence from a credible source, which also means being able to refer to and cite the author. However, at none of the stages in this study were the respondents able to support their claims or subclaims with sourced evidence. Unfortunately, this type of writing is the required university- level analysis that Foundation students aim for.

In summary, we can see how the students advanced during the FA course. Their process of acquiring the capability to write sourced argumentative texts was progressing well. The stages of development were clearly visible from the data presented. The next section will describe the process, qualitatively, from the teacher's perspective. There is expression of

progress, deficiencies and difficulties found during the teaching process. The teacher's journal was the source for this perspective.

3.3 Teacher's journal

The first issue is the students' reading skills. While, the students were able to find direct factual information in reading texts, they had difficulty in discerning the argumentative function of the information they had found. More specifically, students had substantial difficulty in defining the main idea and differentiating the details which refer to, or support, the main idea, in the form of secondary details.

Another issue in reading is students' ability to distinguish the factual value of items they read. In general, the majority of students usually could not initially distinguish between fact and opinion when they started the semester. This item sometimes required a long learning process, even weeks of study. This means that they also had difficulty with the structure of an opinion paragraph, don't know anything about the terms and had difficulty in giving reasons to their claims.

There were several issues about teaching writing that the problems of literacy production were similar to those of literacy recognition, in their reading. Firstly, in writing, many students were learning about some parts of the essay structure (thesis, claim/argument) for the first time, during their FA course. However, most of them were aware of the basic structures of an essay (introduction, main part, conclusion).

Initial knowledge of argumentative paragraphs or essays was minimal. When students were asked to write an argument, the tendency was to write a narrative about personal life experiences, or a descriptive generalization about the topic. The only differentiation was those students who had been preparing for IELTS Writing text were able to imitate the structure of an argumentative essay, but often lacked sufficient creativity to apply it to content which they hadn't learned to write previously.

At the level of the paragraph, there was a lot of work required for students to learn the structure an opinion paragraph, which manifested itself in confusion in the distinction between a paragraph and an essay. In writing the paragraph, students wrote very long examples, with too many details, or going off-topic.

The next issue was students learning to express and defend their opinions. The class started writing simple topics, by expressing a plain positive or negative thesis, in the form of short answers (i.e. yes/no), supporting it with a simple opinion (e.g. "well, I think so"). The next stage in development is usually making a claim, though they don't know that such claims require sourced evidence. As a result, claim structures are taught which force students to create evidentiary structures, such as "…has three advantages / benefits / pluses."

There were certain deficiencies visible in the students' critical thinking faculties. When the class proceeded to brainstorm arguments (sub-claims) in support of a claim, there were difficulties. The first of those was in distinguishing between similar ideas. Students often formulated the same idea in different words and considered them different arguments. One example was the inability to distinguish between the arguments "animals will suffer" and "animals feel pain." There were further problems of finding relevant arguments, and confining them to a single paragraph.

As the essay writing process was being taught, there were stages in the students' development. Firstly, there were difficulties in understanding the task, and how it required an understanding of supporting paragraphs. Students tended to focus on one word in the task (e.g. advertising), and ignore the role of other aspects. Though students knew introductions and conclusions well at the beginning, they had difficulty restructuring them to allow for argumentation. What followed was difficulty in deciding what their opinion was, then allowing for and explaining an opinion which was opposite to their own, and also critiquing or refuting that idea.

Other aspects of their development could be blamed on their lack of a deep culture of study, and of a shallow understanding of the world. In writing introductions, there was a need for explaining the general context of the issue. However, this created difficulty that indicates a lack of reading or short life experience. The last issue was for students to learn the language of cohesion, to connect the parts of paragraphs into a strong narrative.

The work mentioned above was all part of the process of writing. Students learned by doing, as a class, in groups, and individually. By the second half of the semester, when the structures had been practised, most of the students suddenly started to write more independently. The structured learning of argumentation tended to give students a strong foundation in literacy.

4 Discussion

The weaknesses of the participants' L1 (and L2) literacy education was indicated by their questionnaires and interviews. The lack of depth in their reading and writing was found to have affected much of their work in the FA course. This is backed up by the PISA findings (OECD, 2018). First of all, in their reading, it was clear that they could not recognise arguments, and could not separate facts from opinions. This is fairly common, even within Europe (Hayes & Introna, 2005; Timm, 2008; Yassukova, 2020). The lack of cultural awareness which could be used to process cultural issues met in literacy, indicates that it could affect students' progress (Cai & Kunnan, 2019). As shall be shown, this has numerous other knock-on effects in L2 literacy acquisition, as L1 literacy experience could have, if it existed, been used to aid L2 literacy acquisition (Kirkpatrick, 2017; Cummins, 2016).

Firstly, the participants indicated that they had a weak sense of text structure, having only a perfunctory knowledge of the three sections of an essay. This could be seen reflected in the teacher's claim that students had difficulty differentiating between paragraph and essay structures. The students lacked an education in text structure, so that there was not even a

default notion of the paragraph. This is akin to what Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) noticed, when they spoke of L1 writing causing automatic routines. In this case, there were no relevant routines.

Secondly, as found by their teacher, students lacked a sense of a writing task, what its purpose was, and how to proceed to answer the task. This, being as it is, associated with many of the other aspects of essay writing, cannot be linked directly to any specific writing problem, but indirectly, it can be linked to most of the deficiencies seen in their writing. It is a more severe version of what Andrews (2010) had found in new British tertiary students.

Thirdly, many of the analytical parts of an essay text were missing from the participants' background. The first of those was the lack of experience with argument. The participants claimed to have no experience of using arguments and in formulating a thesis. The results were likely related to their inability, at their first writing stage, to write a claim. Furthermore, as a thesis helps structure a text, there is the indication, from the teacher that the students, when they were told to write an argument, defaulted to writing a narrative text (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008).

Culturally, this lack of ability to argue in writing, seems to fit in with analyses of Kazakhstani culture and educational culture (Hofstede, 2011; Yassukova, 2020). In a culture, and school system, where students are taught obedience to subordinates, students are not often allowed to express their opinions, much less support them. Yassukova (2020) found academic thinking, which is more general in nature, was not evident in the post-soviet school system.

Fourthly, the absence of critical thinking in participants' initial writing was evident. This came in many forms. The writers could not provide evidence to back claims, as corroborated by the teacher who saw that students could not defend their opinions. In their reading, the participants could not separate fact from opinion. This indicates that the lack of L1

literacy has created a general weakness at abstraction (Roessingh, 2006). The participants were seen to be weak at manipulating abstract ideas like arguments, opinions, and even facts.

Lastly, weak literacy means weak metacognition. If the participants' L1 literacy background lacked so many of the building blocks of literacy, there were likely no mental structures of critical thinking and analysis. This was indicated in the generally weak literacy metacognition found in the interviews. In such a context, there is no place upon which to build L2-English tertiary genre description (Wei & Zhang, 2020). In fact, it is the L2-English FA program which created these mental frameworks of textual knowledge. It is therefore impressive that the students did recognise the contribution of the FA to creating that framework.

5 Conclusion & Implications

This is one important study in the understanding of the process of L2 literacy acquisition in Anglophone tertiary contexts, in countries where English is a foreign language (Neff, 2013; Anderson, 2007). This study has indicated strong evidence for the importance of a basic L1 literacy pedagogy for all high school students, and most certainly for strengthening the role of literacy in university programs. The knowledge economy is not only about technology, but also the communication of ideas, in an intercultural context. This would be the practical application of advanced literacy.

The students' literacy processes and the experience of the teacher dovetail well. Students' problems with literacy were noticed in their writing, noticed by their teacher during the process, and were apparently due to students' literacy backgrounds. That lends weight to the need for a Foundation program for just such students. Furthermore, this study showed, particularly through the metalanguage investigation, how students with a deficient literacy background understand their literacy process, the need for this process, and how they are taught. This can help a university in improving its processes of course design, to make a more

successful literacy program, better writing instruction, and students who are more able to write independently (Anderson, 2007).

This is a new field in Central Asian studies, but KIMEP is not the only Anglophone university in the area. Further steps in this area of research can be taken by studying literacy practices in the various types of schools (lyceums, foreign-language schools, private and public schools) available in Kazakhstan. Testing could also be used to investigate more precisely students' literacy capabilities and their metacognitive awareness.

The findings in this study could be used to raise awareness of the deficiencies in public education as regards literacy, in order to enhance teachers', principals', and policymakers' knowledge about writing. That would include issues like the syllabus, school curriculums, class sizes, and the training and qualification standards for school teachers, among other topics. Over the long term, it could indeed lead to dramatic educational change on "both sides of the reform coin: better teachers and better systems" (Bransford, DarlingHammond, & LePage, 2005, p. 38).

References

Anderson, N. J. (2007). Metacognition in writing: Facilitating writer awareness. In A. Stubbs (Ed.), Rhetoric, uncertainty, and the university as text: How students construct the academic experience. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina ppg. 19-43

Andrews, R. (2010). Argumentation in higher education. Improving practice through theory and research. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1994). Introduction: Language and relationship to language in the teaching situation. In P. Bourdieu, J-C. Passeron, & M. de Saint Martin (Eds.), Academic discourse: Linguistic misunderstanding and professorial power. Cambridge: Polity Press ppg. 1-34

Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & LePage, P. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. ppg. 1-39

Cai, Y. & Kunnan, A.J. (2019). Detecting the language thresholds of the effect of background knowledge on a Language for Specific Purposes reading performance: A case of the island ridge curve Journal of English for Academic Purposes 42 (100795)

Cummins, J. (2016). Reflections on Cummins (1980), "The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue" TESOL Quarterly 50(4), 940–944

Friedman, D.A. (2019). Citation as a social practice in a TESOL graduate program: A language socialization approach Journal of Second Language Writing 44, 23–36

Hayes, N. & Introna, L.D. (2005). Cultural Values, Plagiarism, and Fairness: When Plagiarism Gets in the Way of Learning Ethics & Behaviour 15(3), 213–231

Hirvela, A. (2017). Argumentation & second language writing: Are we missing the boat? Journal of Second Language Writing 36, 69–74

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture 2(1), 2307-2319.

Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition. New York: Routledge

Jones, C., Turner, J., & Street, B. (Eds.). (1999). Students writing in the university: Cultural and epistemological issues. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. Language Learning, 16(1-2), 1-20

Keck, C. (2014). Copying, paraphrasing, and academic writing development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 summarization practices Journal of Second Language Writing 25, 4–22

Kirkpatrick., A. (2017). How important is argument? Journal of Second Language Writing 36, ppg. 81–82.

National Academy of Education (NAO) (2015a). Standardized Curricula for Foreign Language in Russian schools. Retrieved from https://nao.kz/loader/fromorg/2/25

National Academy of Education (NAO) (2015b). Standardised Curriculum for Russian Language in Russian schools Retrieved from https://nao.kz/loader/fromorg/2/25

Neff-van Aertselaer, J. (2013) Contextualizing EFL argumentation writing practices within the Common European Framework descriptors Journal of Second Language Writing 22, 198–209

Negretti, R. (2012). Metacognition in student academic writing: Longitudinal study of metacognitive awareness and its relation to task perception, self-regulation, evaluation of performance. Written Communication, 29(2), 142-179.

OECD (2018). Education policy outlook Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/education/Education-Policy-Outlook-Country-Profile-Kazakhstan-2018.pdf

Reid, J.M. (1999) The Process of Composition 3rd ed. London: Pearson Education ESL

Roessingh, H. (2006). BICS-CALP: An Introduction for Some, a Review for Others TESL Canada Journal 23(2), 91-96

Ryan, J. & Viete, R. (2009). Respectful interactions: learning with international students in the English-speaking academy, Teaching in Higher Education, 14(3), 303-314

Sharp, A. (2010). Intercultural rhetoric and reading comprehension in a second language Reading Psychology 31, 472–491

Timm, A. (2008). Final report on educational practices in Greece. www.sdaw.info(educational. Accessed May 2012.

Wei, Xing & Zhang, Wenxia (2020) Investigating L2 writers' metacognitive awareness about L1-L2 rhetorical differences Journal of English for Academic Purposes 100875

Yassukova, L.A. (2020). "Izmenemie struktury intellekta podrostkov s 1990 po 2020 gody (Changes in the intellectual structure of teenagers between 1990 and 2020)". Lecture Saint Petersburg psychological summit. St. Petersburg. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hLMdmsp3xaA, on 12 August, 2020