

# Academic Writing

## Global Views and Romanian Trends\*

---

SONIA PAVLENKO • CRISTINA BOJAN  
ANDREI KELEMEN • MIHAELA ALUAS

*Learning to write in the academic world means to learn the rules of the game in order finally to be able to participate in it.*  
(Otto Kruse, "Getting started: Academic Writing in the First Year of a University Education," 2003)

“**P**UBLISH OR perish” has been held as an almost threatening motto in recent years in the academic world, triggering an ever increasing emphasis on academic writing. However, academic writing is not something new/it has been around since the dawn of the modern university. Otto Kruse argues that “a writing-to-learn pedagogy was elaborated as early as about 1820”<sup>1</sup> in Prussia, contemporary with the development of the Humboldtian model of university. Writing has become a “key qualification for all academic professions, not only for academic education.”<sup>2</sup>

This article starts from the most commonly used definitions of academic writing with the aim of exploring a number of global views in the field and of comparing them with the situation in Romania. Though the international literature on academic writing is generous, Romanian developments tend to be rather slow and sometimes even slightly inaccurate. Our intention is to explore them through a case study, namely doctoral students from Babeş-Bolyai University.

\* This work was possible with the financial support of the Executive Unit for Financing Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation through the project Open School for Academic Self-improvement. Research, Academic Writing and Career Management (PN-II-PC-CA-2011-3.1-0682 212/2.07.2012). Sonia Pavlenko would like to acknowledge the financial support of the Sectoral Operational Program for Human Resources Development 2007–2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, within the project POSDRU 89/1.5/S/60189 with the title „Postdoctoral Programs for Sustainable Development in a Knowledge Based Society.”

## Definitions of academic writing

**T**HE PHRASE “academic writing” in itself is a rather recent coinage. Other terms, such as “scientific writing,” used to carry the same meaning, but they have slightly fallen out of use in recent years. The equivalent phrases of academic writing in other languages reveal a variety of ways in which this term is understood (“writing scientifically,” “scientific authoring,” “scientific work,” etc.), hinting at the same time at the relationships between the writer, the process, the outcome and the characteristics of the final text.

Academic writing is a phrase everyone seems to understand; however, few (if any) are capable of accurately defining or describing what it is. Academic writing can be understood at the same time as a process, as the product/result of the process, as a skill or as a text addressed to a specific audience.

Academic writing when seen as a process can be one or more of the following:

- a linguistic process (which looks at the minute details of construction of meaning, such as the manner in which use of certain adverbs yields a specific result);
- a scientific/logic process (which organizes knowledge in the form of the text in a logical sequence, while following a set of standards);
- a rhetoric process (which deals with the ways in which arguments are being built, or conclusions are being proven etc.);
- a manner of “translating”/transferring/converting research results into communicable knowledge.

There are a number of standards that pertain to the process, namely: it has to be correct, to be clear, to be complete, to be objective (to what extent it can be checked), it has to be reliable, transparent, valid (i.e. to what extent the research question is followed in a coherent manner), it has to be based on theory, to have adequate methods, to bring something new, to use clear concepts and to have intellectual probity.<sup>3</sup>

The academic writing seen as a result is often associated with academic reading (and understanding of academic texts) and thus it is paired with the latter for training purposes. In this case the attention falls on the form of the text and on the manner in which its various stylistic and grammatical elements are used.

The academic writing that is mainly defined as targeted for a specific audience is opposed to any other type of writing (as in a newspaper article or a fiction book) and is meant to be an integral part of a community of practice (also named community of knowledge or community of enquiry) which communicates existing and/or new knowledge in a specific manner. In order to be part of such a community, or to contribute to the building of a community of knowledge, an author/writer must always follow a number of (at least perceived) standards, such as objectivity, fidelity to data, rigor and analysis.<sup>4</sup>

Academic writing seen as a skill is often grouped together with other similar academic skills such as critical thinking, oral presentations, media literacy, and so on. It contributes actively to the future employability of the student, young researcher or even academic.

A recent project run at national level by the Romanian Ministry of Education published a “Manual of Scientific Authoring”<sup>5</sup> which approaches academic writing mainly from the perspective of what could be termed as “product management,” i.e. approaching the written text as a product and offering advice on various aspects, starting from selecting the best journal to be published in, going through the peer review procedure and all the way to the ethical aspects of publishing.

In complete opposition to the approach above, the results of a questionnaire we applied on Babeş-Bolyai University’s doctoral students show that they seem to perceive academic writing as being more of a process rather than any other of its four possible aspects. A small minority refer to it as a product or as a manner of belonging to a “community of practice,” while none of the respondents see it as a learnable and/or developable skill.

The elements used to define academic writing are closely connected to the history of development of the manner of teaching academic writing in US and Europe. In the same line of thought, there are various aspects connected to academic writing which help further define the concept, such as: specific demands of the process, various forms of institutional provisions for instruction in academic writing, which in turn lead to specific approaches and specific pedagogies.

Otto Kruse<sup>6</sup> associates with the academic writing three specific demands, namely the demands of knowledge, the demands of language and the demands of communication. The demands of knowledge help the author become integrated into a specific community of practice and of enquiry, as academic texts are seen as part of a “co-operative effort of a scientific community to gain knowledge.”<sup>7</sup> Kruse argues that each new text builds on existing knowledge to make a novel contribution to knowledge and at the same time to point towards knowledge to be produced in the future. Furthermore, “the academic community depends on refereed journals for legitimate new knowledge across fields.”<sup>8</sup> The demands on language highlight the differences between the academic language and the mundane, everyday language that the author might use in other contexts, while the demands of communication refers to the rhetorical dimension, i.e. “the purpose of writing and the effect a text is supposed to have upon the audience.”<sup>9</sup>

Institutional provisions for instruction in academic writing are also very diverse. Coffin et al<sup>10</sup> groups them in five main categories, namely: (a) dedicated writing courses (aimed at acquiring „academic literacy”), (b) disciplinary subject courses (which could be either writing across the curriculum or writing in the disciplines, because “writing happens in specific disciplinary contexts, instruction in such writing should also be located in these courses. One benefit of incorporating writing in the disciplines is that students can see how different forms of writing occur in different contexts.”), (c) study support centers and writing centers (thus assimilating academic writing skills to other “study skills”), (d) English for Academic Purposes (EAP) (aimed mainly at those whose native language is not English) and (e) writing on-line (which provides access to relevant resources and sometimes also offers feedback).

Academic writing tends to be mainly associated with higher education training (though it is not limited only to it). Coffin et al<sup>11</sup> offer an inventory of approaches to academic writing. They identify three main types of approaches: (i) text approaches (which

emphasize the products, i.e. “students’ writing as final texts”), (ii) process approaches (where attention is given to steps and stages of writing rather than to the outcome) and (iii) writing as social practice (where the focus lies on writing as “an activity that always occurs in a social context”).

*In the context of higher education, there are different ways in which student writing can be understood as a “social practice.” First, student writing is always embedded within relationships around teaching and learning and these relationships influence, not least, the extent to which students come to write successfully in higher education. Second, the conventions governing exactly what constitutes “appropriate academic writing” are social to the extent that these have developed within specific academic and disciplinary communities over time. Third, student academic writing is a social practice in that the writers, students, are learning not only to communicate in particular ways, but are learning how to “be” particular kinds of people: that is, to write “as academics,” “as geographers,” “as social scientists.” Thus academic writing is also about personal and social identity. Some students may find it harder or less comfortable to take on these identities than others.<sup>12</sup>*

Björk et al<sup>13</sup> identify specific pedagogies that ensue from a focus on text, writer or discourse community. When the text is in focus, then the academic discourse predominates. This translates into key concerns such as content, text types, meta-cognition as well as scientific genre and genre conventions and so on. The corresponding pedagogy for this approach focuses on general academic writing courses, providing instructional guidelines, formats and templates as well as model examples to large groups or classes. The approach focusing on the writer underlines the individual discourse, having as key concerns the self-expression process (including identity, integrity, spontaneity, as well as blocks or procrastination) and teaches process-writing, revision strategies or strategies such as brainstorming or action writing to individual writers. When the discourse community is in focus, then the discipline-specific discourse is the center point, and the key concerns include academic literacy, discipline-specific conversation, discourse types and discourse jargon, as well as social construction. The pedagogy specific for this type of approach consists of giving advice, providing opportunities for dialogue, discussion, socialization and peer response to small groups.

Macgilchrist<sup>14</sup> classifies teaching genre into three distinct groups, namely (a) the systemic linguistic approach, also known as the Sydney School, (b) the New Rhetoric which stresses situation and context over linguistic aspects and (c) English for Specific Purposes or English for Academic Purposes approach, which is mainly focused on language teaching.

## Global views

**W**ILHELM VON Humboldt’s reform in the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Prussia has contributed to the change in the manner of teaching world-wide, namely leaving behind the medieval university tradition of lectures which had been a characteristic of European universities from their very beginning, and promoting the

creation of written texts by the students. Following this reform, this manner of teaching would be adopted and/or copied and even copied elsewhere in Europe and in various parts of the world, including the United States and Japan, allowing for the academic writing training to develop.

Otto Kruse<sup>15</sup> discusses the evolution of writing as a mode of teaching and learning by looking at the changes that universities had to go through in order to move from the medieval practices of oral rhetoric to the seminar pedagogy in Prussia. Thus, he shows “how seminar writing not only gradually pervaded the teaching of all disciplines, but also actively shaped the disciplines by promoting specialization and distinction.”<sup>16</sup> One possible indicator of this change was the development of scientific journals from the 18<sup>th</sup> century territory of today’s Germany: until 1790, of 3440 scientific journals 470 were of general science, and over 1200 were specialized on one discipline,<sup>17</sup> in comparison to the situation of the 17<sup>th</sup> century when there were only a few scientific journals, which covered general topics.<sup>18</sup> These journals marked the birth of the forms of review and abstract and the seminar students learnt how to use correctly the new conventions of academic writing, such as footnotes, citations, bibliography, with the hope of writing for these journals one day.<sup>19</sup> Before the Humboldtian reform, the first writing seminar-ies appear as part of language courses, in 1737.<sup>20</sup> Kruse<sup>21</sup> takes advantage “of the fact that all Prussian seminars had to be approved by the Ministry of Education and therefore had to submit detailed seminar regulations allowing a close examination of how writing was pedagogically embraced in seminar teaching.”<sup>22</sup>

However, despite the early German beginnings, academic writing flourished on US territory, so much so that at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the majority of the US universities had academic writing as part of their education and training of students.<sup>23</sup> The roots of academic writing go back to the 17<sup>th</sup> century with the so called Grammar Schools of Rhetoric writing for immigrants. From the premises set by these Grammar Schools, courses of composition are later born at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century as part of the curriculum.<sup>24</sup> The US tradition was formed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, being based on two approaches: one relied on the classical rhetoric and the other one on the introduction of writing seminars in the curriculum.<sup>25</sup> This led to important changes not only to university pedagogy, but also to the institutional structure of the higher education institutions; namely students worked in an autonomous manner, and the academics replaced the courses that transmitted a general vision of the world with specialized seminar topics, at the same time transmitting specialized research methods to students. This way the switch is made from teaching general information to specialized research. Germany would reach this point only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century—what the US had imported from Germany in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Germany would import back from the US in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.<sup>26</sup>

Girgensohn<sup>27</sup> identifies three main trends of development in the pedagogy of academic writing:

- (a) a composition course: starting from the first year of university study which has the aim of homogenizing the differences between the levels of knowledge and skills of students. This is a single subject, often independent from the Language Depart-

ments. In class, the focus is not on writing as an isolated activity, but on supporting students to see themselves as writers. All students must learn to express themselves and to learn how to argue properly.

- (b) a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program: appeared first in the UK and US at the end of the 1970s. As opposed to the composition course, it attempts to take over the responsibility of developing academic writing skills from one single course by suggesting multiple courses for this skill in the curriculum. Students do not learn “how” to write, but rather “learn by writing”. Consequently writing becomes a teaching method.
- (c) writing centers: institutions that appear at the center of universities. They serve students of all subjects and years, being thus the more over-reaching. These writing centers are present today in about 90% of the US universities and they offer individual counselling on academic writing and support in the development of academic authors.

European concerns regarding academic writing have been noted beginning with the 1990s. European universities have a different attitude regarding teaching and learning academic writing, namely until the early 1990s they did not pay much attention to it and did not consider it to be of great importance.<sup>28</sup> Writing was seen as an inborn talent, which one either has or not, and which cannot be taught (even though not every student possesses this talent).<sup>29</sup> Other start from the premises that being admitted to the university entails being already able to write academically, having had previous training for the high-school leaving exam(s) and/or maturity exam(s).<sup>30</sup> The academics generally were not aware of how heterogeneous the academic writing landscape was in Europe, as it has been marked by various traditions, ways of thinking and communicating, research methods and discourses about the method.<sup>31</sup>

Siepmann<sup>32</sup> summarizes three main intellectual styles in approaching academic writing, based on Galtung’s<sup>33</sup> previous work. First, there is the Anglo-Saxon style (which includes both the US and the UK), characterized by “avid collection and organization of data in what is often a team effort.” This leads to the style favoring hypothesis generation over theory formation and an active peer dialogue, seeking to “smooth out divergences of opinion” and being “more tolerant of diversity.” The typical questions raised by this style are “How do you operationalize it?” (US version) and “How do you document it?” (UK version). Second, there is the French intellectual style, which is mostly preoccupied with “linguistic artistry.” Clarity and elegance of style rank on the same place as theory formation, and “the best theory is one which shows balance and symmetry.” Criticism of peers is not direct, and the typical research question is: “Peut-on dire cela en bon français?” [Can you say this in good French?]. Thirdly, there is the German intellectual style which is mainly focused on the “fundamental issues of theory formation and deductive reasoning rather than data analysis and induction. In this intellectual style, knowledge is passed on from the master to the apprentice, while the typical research question is “Wie können Sie das ableiten?” [How can you derive this?].

Starting with the 1990s, various studies were carried out that evaluated the degree of development of the academic writing skills of students,<sup>34</sup> and it was found that in one

university 80% of those interviewed recognized that they had had problems with academic writing and researchers could link the drop-out rate and the study performance with the challenges raised by academic writing<sup>35</sup>. In comparison with the US models, only the writing centers spread in Europe, i.e. the expert model.<sup>36</sup> The other two alternatives (composition and WAC) never took strong roots in Europe. There is also the issue of the multitude of languages in Europe, which further raises the question whether academic writing should follow the discipline across languages and cultures or there should be a number of general aspects that refer to the writing process itself, which is non-dependent neither on the discipline nor on the field of writing.<sup>37</sup>

The Bologna Process has also had an impact on the development of academic writing in the European higher education. It triggered national reforms which restructured the universities; if these changes were not purely administrative ones, then they should have caused a change in teaching in general; thus it becomes clear that the students' study goals have changed as well: from simply storing information to working with information,<sup>38</sup> from developing as part of a group to personal development based on specific needs. The culture of learning changed, including the employability requirements, and consequently the approach of academic writing changed. Thus there is a shift from teaching to learning, and to a learning-by-doing pedagogy, having at their core the student. Furthermore, academic writing could be seen as a means of achieving the study goals in the context of the Bologna process.

## Academic Writing in Romania

**S**IEPMANN<sup>39</sup> MAKE a synthesis of a wide range of comparative studies regarding the main differences between the English, French and German academic writing, as presented in the table.

**DIFFERENCES IN ACADEMIC WRITING  
BETWEEN ENGLISH, FRENCH AND GERMAN (ADAPTED FROM SIEPMANN)**

	English	French	German
Text structures (Schröder 1988)	'point-early', linear structure: the main point is usually made at the outset of the argument	'point-early' or 'point-late' (the latter mainly in classical dissertations, newspaper comments, essays)	'point-late', spiral-like structure: theoretical exposition prepares for the main point to be made at the end of the argument.
Text acts (Sachtleber 1993)	Preference for one continuous text act	Preference for one continuous text act [erklärend-darstellende Deskription]	Preference for a variety of text acts [spezifizierende Deskription]

	English	French	German
Authorial self-reference (Hutz 1997, Trumpp 1998)	More authorial statements (I/we) <-> cooperative writing style	Frequent use of the majestic plural	Fewer 'personal' statements; more impersonal constructions (e.g. <i>man</i> ); higher use of the inclusive <i>we</i> ( <i>here we have a. . .</i> ) <-> author centred writing style

SOURCE: Dirk Siepmann, "Academic Writing and Culture: An Overview of Differences between English, French and German," *Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal*, 51, 1, 2006: 132–133.

By looking at the history of higher education institutions in Romania, we could say that the approaches had varied both in space and in time. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the higher education institutions from Southern and Eastern regions of Romania (mainly from Bucharest and Iassy) favored a French approach, while the university from Cluj-Napoca (north-western part of the country) was under the influence of the German-style of writing. During the communist regime, the writing had to conform to the strictness of the "official speak" of the regime, borrowing a variety of standard expressions ironically but at the same time brilliantly defined as the "wooden language." However, in the last two decades, the English model started to be embraced as well, as English has become the *lingua franca* of communicating in science. However, there is no unique model for writing academically, as the manner of writing depends to a great extent on the field of research, the training of the individual and the tradition above-mentioned.

During the communist regime, research was taken out of the universities and placed into academies and research institutions, and academic writing was mainly linked to research. High standards in academic writing were never an issue during the communist regime. In the field of humanities academic writing was restricted mainly to literature reviews, while writing the results of research and research itself in the academies and specialized institutions was, more or less, gravitating around the soviet science school, and therefore publishing in other countries than those in the Eastern block was never a real option. Exceptions exist however, and they are notable. Surely there were a number of minimal standards of the soviet science school to be followed; however, at the same time, Romanians writing scientific texts had to consider the censorship and the possible interpretations the political police might read into their texts before committing anything to paper. Advancement in the academia and personal professional track-record were two notions which did not require matching, promotion criteria being usually linked to seniority and/or "healthy origins."

After the fall of the communist regime, research has returned to universities and slowly regained a position on the agenda of decision-making actors. Romania's desire to join the European Union was a key factor in advancing the issue of financing research on the national political agenda with potential implications connected to academic writing. There were several reports of the European Commission during Romania's negotiations with the EU in which European officials set out recommendations regarding the im-

provements that were required to boost the Romanian research capacity, among these a higher allocation for education and research from the GDP.<sup>40</sup>

Starting with 2007, after Romania's accession to the EU, research and development activities advanced at a fairly rapid pace, although financing has remained a crucial issue. Unlike the previous years, where chronic underfinancing was generally the norm, Romania began seeing R&D as one way to create economic advantages and opportunities on the European single market. The “miracle of rebirth” of R&D lasted for only two years, when again underfinancing reclaimed the attention of researchers—who in 2009 petitioned Romanian officials to allocate towards R&D the needed 1% of the national GDP. Yet results were beginning to show, illustrated especially by the increased scientific production. As an eloquent example, Babeş-Bolyai University (BBU), one of the leading universities in Romania, recorded in 2008 an increase in ISI scientific papers of 91% in comparison to the year 2006. The numerical progress was facilitated by substantial financial allocations.<sup>41</sup> On a larger scale, the last years' legislative reforms (2010 and 2011) in the higher education system in Romania have positively impacted the organization of doctoral studies in Romania, creating the framework for bringing up and supporting, as core principles, organization and funding of doctoral studies based on quality criteria, selection of PhD candidates alongside the introduction of instruments to track and upkeep performance of PhD candidates, while also satisfying the need for transparency and accountability of doctoral programs.

Scientific production has been upheld even under national budgetary scarcity, as structural and cohesion funds have become available starting 2007. Between 2007 and 2010 non-reimbursable money of the Sectorial Operational Program for Human Resources Development (SOPHRD) was directed towards specific funding measures – grant and strategic projects aiming to change and develop the field of higher education with a specific regard to doctoral and postdoctoral studies. One of the key areas of intervention was designed to sustain strategic partnerships in national projects that should impact the system as well as projects that should act at “grass route” level. The HE system, underfinanced especially in terms of systemic resources for supporting doctoral and postdoctoral programs, received a very consistent flow of financial resources that brought back to life reformative, daring initiatives. Consequently at the national level, MECTS-UEFISCDI (the Ministry of Education, Research, Youth and Sport—Executive Agency for Higher Education Research Development Innovation Funding) initiated two strategic projects dedicated to doctoral studies in Romania that involved all major actors in the area of doctoral studies: “Doctoral Studies in Romania—Organization of the Doctoral Studies” and “Doctorate in Universities of Excellence—Research Assessment and Support for Scientific Publishing.” The later recorded the first national undertaking in outlining academic writing. Recommendations were gathered in a manual published by UEFISCDI (Executive Unit for Financing Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation) entitled *Manual autorat științific* [Manual for scientific authoring].

Babeş-Bolyai University, being actively involved in the identification of potential financing sources for doctoral studies, as part of its own development strategy, applied for structural and cohesion funds available through the SOPHRD. As such, hundreds of doctoral candidates in three consecutive cohorts (enrolments in 2008,

2009 and 2009) in natural sciences and in humanities and socio-economic studies were financed throughout their doctoral cycle. The projects covered monthly fellowships, costs of national and international mobility, participations in conferences and training modules. For the first time in a formal and general framework, BBU offered to all of the PhD candidates enrolled in the projects the opportunity to acquire some of the skills and competencies needed for a successful career in research, among which academic writing held a central role. Additionally, postdoctoral research has also been targeted, more than 100 fellows being exposed to transversal competencies trainings. A poll designed for assessing, among other things, the utility of such training programs offered to doctoral and postdoctoral researchers has revealed that developing transferable skills which can positively impact the future insertion of the PhD holders in the academia or the labor market should remain a constant focus. To the question “Please indicate which is, in your opinion, the most appropriate way in organizing academic writing training sessions,” 57.8% of respondents indicated that academic writing should be included, as a regular course offered, in the doctoral and postdoctoral programs, while more than 50% pointed towards the fact that their writing skills have been improved to some extent or significantly as a result of taking part in the transferable skills training programs facilitated as part of their scholarships.

Romanian universities have not approached academic writing in a pro-active manner. There are no centers of academic writing in any Romanian university. However, many majors in various universities offer courses supporting academic writing skills, such as “Thesis Writing,” “Methodology of Research” and so on, but there is not a consistent approach to academic writing throughout the entire curriculum of a major or that of a faculty. There is also the expectation that the doctoral student might be trained in academic writing by his/her mentor, but there are many cases in which the mentor does not know how to develop these skills in the supervised students.

## Conclusions

**O**UR ANALYSIS has shown that the European trend in the field of academic writing is to set up independent centers of Academic Writing, which could both provide support and offer expertise to all those in the university, starting with the freshman and all the way to the experienced academic. Arguably the best solution for Romanian universities would be to set up courses with clearly defined syllabi developing basic academic writing skills at Bachelor level and to offer support and skills training through specialized centers for graduate students and academics. However, there remains an open debate whether these centers should teach academic writing with the specific characteristics of the language one writes in in mind or whether the field addressed should take precedence over everything else. Our ongoing work within BBU concerning academic writing is trying to identify the most appropriate methodology for teaching academic writing both to undergraduates and graduate students within the specific context of Romanian native speakers that try to write proficiently in other languages, such as English and German.



## Notes

1. Otto Kruse, "The Origins of Writing in the Disciplines: Traditions of Seminar Writing and the Humboldtian Ideal of the Research University," *Written Communication* 23, 3 (July 2006): 333.
2. Otto Kruse, "Getting started: Academic Writing in the First Year of a University Education." in *Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education*, eds. Lennart Björk, Gerd Bräuer, Lotte Rienecker, and Peter Stray Jörgensen (New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003), 28.
3. Karoline Rotzoll, *Leitfaden zum wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten* (Ruhr Universität Bochum: Fakultät für Ostasienwissenschaft, 2008), 1.
4. A. Suresh Canagarajah, *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*, (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 2002), 50–52.
5. *Manual de Autorat Stiintific. Manual de Formare. Scrierea Publicațiilor Stiintifice*, ed. Ioan Dumitrache, Horia Iovu, available at , 2011.
6. Kruse, "Getting," 23–27.
7. *Ibid.*, 24.
8. Kruse, "The Origins," 332.
9. *Ibid.*, 336.
10. Caroline Coffin, Mary Jane Curry, Sharon Goodman, Ann Hewings, Theresa M. Lillis and Joan Swann, *Teaching Academic Writing. A Toolkit for Higher Education* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 5–9.
11. *Ibid.*, 9–12.
12. *Ibid.*, 10.
13. *Teaching Academic Writing in European Higher Education*, eds. Lennart Björk, Gerd Bräuer, Lotte Rienecker, and Peter Stray Jörgensen (New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003), 10.
14. Felicitas Macgilchrist, "Publish or Perish? A Genre Approach to Getting Published in Leading English-language Journals," in *Neue Wege zur Schlüsselqualifikation Schreiben. Autonome Schreibgruppen an der Hochschule*, ed. Katrin Girgensohn (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2007), 156.
15. Otto Kruse, "Zur Geschichte des wissenschaftlichen Schreibens. Teil 1" in *Das Hochschulwesen: Forum für Hochschulforschung: Praxis und Politik* 5 (2005): 170–174. and Kruse, "The Origins," 331–352.
16. Kruse, "The Origins," 333.
17. David A. Kronick, *A History of Scientific and Technical Periodicals. The Origins and Development of the Scientific and Technical Press*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed, (Metuchen N.J., The Scarecrow Press, 1976), 94.
18. These journals generally did not enjoy a very long life – almost ¾ of them did not live past their 5<sup>th</sup> year of existence. Kruse, "Zur Geschichte," 172.
19. *Id.*
20. *Id.*
21. Kruse, "The Origins," 333.
22. For a full discussion of this, see Kruse, "The Origins," 331–352.
23. Katrin Girgensohn, *Neue Wege zur Schlüsselqualifikation Schreiben. Autonome Schreibgruppen an der Hochschule*, (VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden, 2007), 33–35. and Kruse, "Zur Geschichte," 170.
24. Girgensohn, *Neue Wege*, 33.
25. Kruse, "Zur Geschichte," 170.
26. *Ibid.*, 170–171.

27. Girgensohn, *Neue Wege*, 33–43.
28. Ibid., 43–44.
29. Björk et al, *Teaching*, 7.
30. K. Ehlich, A. Steets, “Einleitung.” in: *Wissenschaftlich schreiben – lehren und lernen*, eds. K. Ehlich, A. Steets (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), 1.
31. Kruse, “Getting,” 19–28.
32. Dirk Siepman, “Academic Writing and Culture: An Overview of Differences between English, French and German,” *Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators’ Journal* 51, 1 (2006): 132–133.
33. J. Galtung, “Structure, Culture and Intellectual Style.” *Social Science Formation* 20 (1981): 817–856.
34. Girgensohn, *Neue Wege*, 44.
35. Otto Kruse, E. M. Jakobs, “Schreiben lehren an der Hochschule: Ein Überblick” in *Schlüsselkompetenz Schreiben. Konzepte, Methoden, Projekte für Schreibberatung und Schreibdidaktik an der Hochschule*, eds. Otto Kruse, E. M. Jakobs, G. Ruhmann (Neuwies, Krefel: Luchterhand, 1999), 25.
36. Björk et al, *Teaching*, 12.
37. Id.
38. Girgensohn, *Neue Wege*, 48.
39. Siepman, “Academic Writing,” 142–143.
40. The level of investments in research would have had to increase from 1% to 3% of the GDP by the year 2010, of which percentage 2/3 represented financial contribution of the private sector. Investments in research would increase each year by 8% for the public sector and 9% for the private sector. *Știința și cercetarea*, eds. Elena Simina Tănăsescu, Aurel Ciobanu-Dordea, (Bucharest: Dacris, 2004), 14.
41. While in 2006 the research grants (national and international funding sources) for BBU amounted to 20.076.000 lei, in 2008 the amount was more than three times higher. In 2009 funds allocated for research within the university plummeted to 23.000.000 lei, just a little over the amount available in 2006.

### **Abstract**

#### **Academic Writing: Global Views and Romanian Trends\***

Academic writing is a field not sufficiently explored nor investigated in Romania to date. This article aims at offering the fundamental characteristics of academic writing by analyzing global views and contrasting them to Romanian perspectives. It discusses the main-stream approaches to academic writing, looking at its development from a historical perspective and then analyzing comparatively contemporary approaches. Furthermore, it investigates Romanian efforts in the direction of developing academic writing awareness and suggests a possible path to be taken by Romanian higher education institutions.

### **Key words**

academic writing, scientific writing, scientific authoring, scientific production