Title

Intercultural Communication in the Global Classroom

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1mx8w1k9

Journal

Authors

Herrington, TyAnna K.
Tretyakov, Yuri P.

Publication Date

2012

DOI

Copyright Information

Department of Foreign Languages
St. Petersburg Research Center
Russian Academy of Sciences

RUSSIAN-AMERICAN LINKS:
300 YEARS OF COOPERATION

Edited by
Yuri P. Tretyakov
and **Natalia A. Alexandrova**

Российская Академия наук
Санкт-Петербургский научный центр
Кафедра иностранных языков

РОССИЙСКО-АМЕРИКАНСКИЕ СВЯЗИ:
300 ЛЕТ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА

Под редакцией
Ю. П. Третьякова,
Н. А. Александровой

TyAnna K. Herrington

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA

Yuri P. Tretyakov

Russian Academy of Sciences; European University
at St. Petersburg, Russia

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION
IN THE GLOBAL CLASSROOM

Проект «Глобальный класс» представляет собой виртуальное об-
разовательное пространство, позволяющее студентам из разных
стран участвовать в коллективном обсуждении вопросов меж-
культурной электронной коммуникации, а также проводить со-
вместные исследования коммуникационных процессов, имеющих
место в ходе научного общения в областях их специфических ин-
тересов. В статье содержится описание проекта и ряда техни-
ческих и педагогических проблем, возникающих при его осу-
ществлении.

INTRODUCTION. The Global Classroom Project jointly developed by the
School of Literature, Communication, and Culture, Georgia Institute of
Technology (Atlanta, Georgia, USA) and the Language Center of the European
University at St. Petersburg (Russia) is a framework of experientially based
cross-cultural, digital learning environments in which students from
disparate areas of the world attend classes, analyze issues in cross-cultural,
digital communication as they relate to specific subject-area interests, and
jointly develop communication products that reflect what they learn. This
article describes the project and the complexity of issues that we (the project
professors) face in its implementation, especially as they relate to the
problems of establishing and maintaining successful communication among
students and professors belonging to diverse cultures. Since spring 2000,
we have been collaboratively teaching a distance learning (DL) project on

both graduate and undergraduate levels to students at the Georgia Institute
of Technology and the European University at St Petersburg. To our
knowledge, our project is the only distance learning course that has been
jointly developed from its inception and truly reflects the academic and
cultural interests of the U.S. and Russia. It is completely interactive in
nature, and is not dependent on canned «course in a box» materials such
as CD ROMs or video lectures. The partners are equal in their access to
information and their right to express and criticize ideas, which excludes
the element of one-sided «missionary» instruction typical of most DL
courses. The project provides experiential learning environments in which
students in Russia, the U.S., and now also Sweden, truly collaborate in
class discussion and analysis of issues in cross-cultural and digital com-
munication, and produce creative digital artifacts that reflect the synthetic
knowledge acquired in their analyses.

Our work with the Global Classroom Project at times seems to create
more questions about cross-cultural, digital communication than it ans-
wers, but we have found that the unanswered questions continue to drive
us and our students and challenge us to persevere. Significantly, the mul-
tiple problems we face in creating an efficient learning environment for
Russian, American, and, now Swedish students (from the Blekinge Institute
of Technology, Karlskrona, Sweden) provides us with a broader view of
how intercultural communication really happens. This article is a way to
share what we have learned from our experiences, encourage others to
participate in similar projects, and to provide a series of questions to which
others may respond.

One of the most important aspects of the project and truly its driving
force is that its operation is based in negotiative processes. From its
inception, we have been intent to find common benefits of project goals
and have developed activities organized around the needs of all par-
ticipating students, professors, administrations, and institutions. A su-
ccessful negotiative process of this kind requires that the participants be
willing to focus their activities on choices that are best for all institutions
in the countries they represent rather than only on what is best for each
individually. The process requires flexibility from its participants and a
broader view of course concerns than would be motivated simply by self-
interest. Our negotiative work in which we have been flexible and willing

to adjust our own goals to accommodate the needs of others has led to an extremely rewarding negotiative process among professors, administrators, and institutions in Russia, Sweden, and America and well supports the overall project goal of forwarding effective cross-cultural international communication.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION. The overall intent of the Global Classroom Project is to study, in practical application, how to develop effective cross-cultural, digital communication in technical communication and subject-specific areas such as history, sociology, and political science. Our goal is to provide our students with a unique experience of discovering a common language with their colleagues abroad that will facilitate their participation in international projects in the future. The course is a forum in which faculty and students from different countries participate in digital classes to support discussion, information-sharing, and collaboratively developed projects.

The research subjects that our students approach from the vantage points of their respective fields of study all deal with aspects of communication. For example, among other topics, the students have compared visual and verbal rhetorical representations in Russian and American postcard sites on the Web; they have examined the structure of web-based news sites hosted in Russia and the U.S., explored issues in propaganda as it finds its way into TV, print media, and the Internet, and have compared the differing cultural definitions and applications of the term, «terrorism». The current semester (spring of 2003) is devoted to a collaborative study of perceptions and misconceptions of iconic representations in the Russian and American cultures.

The structure of the Global Classroom Project allows us to focus on issues in communication as both theory based content areas for research as well as means for practical experience in the same area. The quality of the students' work depends on their ability to determine the most effective means to communicate accurately, clearly, and effectively. Their work products include resumes, proposals, analytical reports, and creative digital projects as well as synchronous and asynchronous discussions via WebBoard web-based communication soft...e that allows graphic as well as textual interchange over distance.

WebBoard software, running efficiently from a dedicated server at the European University, is optimal because it can be accessed from anywhere in the world by anyone with a web-based connection to the Internet. Not only is WebBoard a tool for communication and a «cyberspace» for class participation, it acts as a database for all the class transcripts and much of the students' collaborative interactions created since spring 2000. Any materials that can be loaded to the Web, can also be loaded into this communication site. Students sometimes add links to websites they find helpful, to graphic images, and may link to sound or video files. An image or sound may also be imbedded within a post itself. This makes it possible to bring up an image within a post to help facilitate discussion of its characteristics or significance.

In addition to WebBoard, both students and instructors use email for one-to-one and small group discussions for collaborative project development. WebBoard is a public forum, just like a classroom, and is not always optimal for working out details for student group project development or instructors' discussions on lesson plans and students' work evaluations, so email makes a good supplement to what is already provided in virtual class space.

Our work during seven semesters has allowed us to develop a course structure that appears adequate for the purposes of the project. It includes the four «standard» phases of a collaborative writing course (1. collaborative group and topics selection; 2. formal report proposals submission; 3. report discussions; 4. formal report completion, revision, and submission).[1] The activities in problem solving that support communicative interaction and effectuate the development of work in the course, by necessity, go way beyond requirements for completing the tangible assignments.

TIME, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY. An undertaking that spans landmass, time, technological access, national and institutional borders, the Global Classroom Project provides special challenges in each of these areas. The format of the present article allows us only to mention some of them.

One of the first challenges we faced in developing the project and then expanding it to add our work with the Swedish students was to arrange the course to accommodate the different semester schedules at the European University and Georgia Tech, and now the Blekinge Institute of Technology.

Georgia Tech classes begin and end 2 weeks earlier than those at the European University and the Blekinge Institute.

In addition, the classes are not only scheduled on different days of the week, the varying time differences of eight hours, six hours and two hours among locations makes it important to develop strategies to ensure that classes are actually «attended» by all the students with regularity.

As the Global Classroom Project attracts more and more students each semester and the number of participants in virtual discussions and joint projects grows, it becomes more difficult to handle the sheer bulk of communication that goes on within the course. We try to deal with this situation both by developing an easy-to-understand structure of web conferences and threads and by splitting the class into smaller international groups, each operating within its designated threads and only meeting for general discussions within specially assigned conferences. Some of the challenges we face are purely technological in nature, however. Slow lines, server breakdowns, and computer viruses require that the teachers continuously monitor the process of communication and seek immediate technical assistance in time of crises.

LANGUAGE, COMMUNICATION, AND CULTURE. Beyond the range of tangible difficulties noted above, the major problems we encounter lie in the sphere of intercultural communication itself. We focus here on issues regarding Russian and American students because the bulk of our experiences to date have dealt with these cultures. The cultural diversity, and therefore the difference in Russian and American students' background knowledge and experiences are very significant. Besides, both classes, the American class especially, are multicultural in themselves, which effectively turns the problem of communication between two cultures into the problem of interaction among multiple cultures. When our Swedish students join full force in fall 2003, we expect even further diversity in attitude and cultural contribution. We not only strive to overcome the difficulties, but teaching our students how to face these challenges and appreciate the benefits is precisely what the Global Classroom Project is about. By learning to solve communication problems in class, our students obtain experience that will be invaluable to them once they engage in international projects in their future workplaces.

TROUBLE-SHOOTING. Three years of work with the Global Classroom Project has helped us locate specific problem areas for cross-cultural, digital communication. This section of the article focuses on some of the broad and more specifically identifiable groups of culturally based communication problems faced by our students and provides some of the more effective solutions we have applied. We categorize them as follows:

1. Language problems:
1.a. English-based instruction
1.b. handling the bulk of WebBoard and email posts
1.c. differences in culturally developed speech patterns

2. Interaction problems:
2.a. Russian students' difficulty in adjusting to computer classrooms
2.b. Russian students' difficulty in adjusting to collaborative work
2.c. Russian students' computer access difficulties
2.d. dealing with the unusual nature of digital communication

3. Cultural problems per se:
3.a. lack of interpersonal connection — inhibitions of time and distance
3.b. differences in cultural expectation

4. Problems of learning/teaching styles
4.a. conflicting teaching and learning structures
4.b. overcoming professor control

Although in each semester the context for communication changes, thus the kinds of problems we encounter change also, over the past three years we have begun to note some patterns that have allowed us to formulate varying degrees of effective solutions. We describe broad communication problem areas and their solutions below:

1. The language of instruction and communication in the Global Classroom is English. There are several reasons for this: the Russian and Swedish students participating in the project are taking the course in part to pursue their requirement in English language study and it is rare that American students have even a beginning facility with Russian or Swedish. Beyond these reasons, in most multinational settings, the need for a lingua franca is apparent and English is a natural choice.

1.a. Problem: English-based instruction
Discussion and solutions:

Beyond what we noted above, both the Russian and Swedish students meet portions of their language instruction requirements by taking their Global Classroom Project classes. They are able to gain communication experience with authentic English speakers who use a common everyday version of English speech patterns. Very few American students have mastered Russian or Swedish language on a level that would make complex communication possible, making English instruction almost mandatory for enabling the project. In addition, there are extensive problems in effectuating character encoding that will transmit Cyrillic and some Swedish characters, which make it difficult to access languages other than English. This contributes to the necessity that project courses be taught in English. Since the project's inception we have discussed plans for adding a component of Americans who use Russian as a second language to provide linguistic balance. We still hope that this development will someday be possible.

The Russian and Swedish students' command of English is generally good. However, there are several specific areas where they encounter difficulties «talking» to their American colleagues. English is highly idiomatic, and the American students, who come to Georgia Tech from all over the country, use phraseology, colloquialisms and slang that at times are difficult to understand, even for the Americans themselves. Another stumbling block is abbreviations that are much more common in everyday English than in Russian or Swedish, particularly, abbreviations specific to a given area or institution (e. g., STaC student — student majoring in Science, Technology, and Culture). To solve this problem, we make the American students aware that they must moderate their language accordingly[2]. We also create a separate question-and-answer conference on WebBoard that is fully devoted to language issues and encourage students to discuss linguistic questions there.

1.b. Problem: handling the sheer bulk of WebBoard and email posts
Discussion and solutions:

Each student in the project posts up to 60–80 messages in different conferences during a semester and reads approximately 2100 posts. Both

the WebBoard conference site and email boxes fill with messages quickly and continue to expand throughout the semester. To help with this problem, we teach the students to use the tools within WebBoard that highlight only new posts each time they log in. This allows them to ignore old posts and quickly focus on those that concern them directly. We also encourage students to create collaborative group structures that allow them to divide and delegate both their group duties and the communication duties that go with them so that each student is responsible for fewer emails and WebBoard posts.

Despite the detriments of the large bulk of communication that students undertake, participation in multiple discussions provides non-native speakers of English with a unique opportunity to be exposed to their American colleagues' speech patterns (greetings, encouragement, etc.) that represent the living language of their own age/social group. The Russians and Swedes acquire these patterns surprisingly fast both because they are fully «believable», coming as they are from native speakers, and because the students are highly motivated since they strive to participate in discussions as equal partners.

1.c. Problem: Differences in culturally developed speech patterns
Discussion and solutions:

Despite the benefits of exposure, non-American students require specific instruction concerning the modality of their messages: ways of making suggestions, expressing agreement/disagreement, and satisfaction/dissatisfaction, etc. These communication requirements differ from country to country, so all nationalities of students need to understand the differing cultural speech patterns from country to country. For instance, Russian speech patterns often require more direct communication than what Americans from the deep south of Georgia (USA) expect, so the Americans need to understand that more straightforward replies to their ideas from Russians are the norm and do not necessarily imply harsh criticism. The Americans also learn that they need to be more direct in their own speech if they want to ensure effective communication of preferences as they negotiate group activities. Attention to communication register is no less important; however, the knowledge of register is acquired not through

instruction but experientially. Non-native speakers easily follow the Americans from the highly informal introductory discussions to more formal debates on the goals and structure of their projects to the highly formalized language of proposals and analytical reports.

2. A new digital communication environment presents a major difficulty for the Russian students. Even though it is one of the European University's main pedagogical goals to create a more «liberal» or «westernized» learning environment, first-year graduate students arrive there with the old school experience in which they have had no training in virtual classes or collaborative projects.

2.a. Problem: Russian students' difficulty in adjusting to computer classrooms
Discussion and solutions:
Russian students participating in the project face a double difficulty. On the one hand, few of them have experience of computer-assisted learning and participation in virtual discussions. On the other, the time differences between Europe and America make synchronous communication in chat format practically impossible. Therefore, most discussions happen in an asynchronous mode; to keep such a discussion going efficiently requires constant attention and extreme concentration and diligence. We also provide as many tips as possible for dealing with the time differences. These include prompting students to email and post on WebBoard a day before they think they need to and developing project drafts much earlier than the deadlines. We also encourage students to schedule small group synchronous online chat sessions and even communicate by phone, if they feel the need. These more direct synchronous meetings can help students work through project difficulties in a more efficient manner when needed to jump-start project roadblocks.

2.b. Problem: Russian students' difficulty in adjusting to collaborative work
Discussion and solutions:
The collaborative work process is difficult for all students, even when they have had prior experience with it. Students must negotiate together

to choose topics, allocate duties, create schedules, provide research, discuss content, write their analyses, and revise their work, and do so across cultural, digital, and temporal boundaries. We ask a lot of all the students, but particularly the Russians, to participate a project of this kind without having had prior experience in any or most of these areas. We provide the Russian students with as much support as possible through their adjustment process and encourage the American students to do the same. Other than that, experience itself is the best way to overcome adjustment difficulty and this process is a part of the course experience and their course of learning.

2.c. Problem: Russian students' computer access difficulties
Discussion and solutions:
Another problem that is specific to Russian students is their need to adjust to taking part in virtual discussions with multiple partners. They have to learn to find their way through a conference with dozens of posts, choose messages they want to respond to and write a response — all within the time allotted to them, since most Russian students have limited access to computers. Some of the ways to help them access their assignments and discussion materials with efficiency is to create new conferences for each discussion, ask the Americans to limit their posts to no more than 3 paragraphs, and to limit the number of class topic discussions we assign while the students are developing their collaborative projects.

2.d. Problem: Dealing with the unusual nature of digital communication
Discussion and solutions:
Virtual communication via WebBoard and email that our students use for person-to person interaction with their colleagues «challenges the binary opposition between oral and written types of discourse».[3] In other words, although written in nature, computer-mediated communication has features characteristic of oral conversation: general informality, brevity, immediate reaction. The dual nature of online communication that carries some characteristics of literacy and some characteristics of orality can be challenging to all the students. We encourage students to be free to use colloquial speech patterns when communicating in online class discussions and to use even more colloquial text in their collaborative group

work. But we make the need for speech distinctions clear by asking for more formal linguistic patterns in their class assignments and class presentations.

3. Whatever serious breakdowns of communication our students have experienced have not been due to linguistic misunderstanding or technological difficulties — they have been caused by cultural clashes. «Because language is informed by culture, failure to understand the conventions of a culture can result in miscommunication».[4] The problem of cultural differences per se — in background knowledge, in values and perceptions, in dominant learning styles — is central to the project. Creation of a comfortable multicultural atmosphere is essential for its success. For this reason, «multicultural education» constitutes a significant part of the course, taking up to one third of the allotted time.

3.a. Problem: Lack of interpersonal connection — inhibitions of time and distance
Discussion and solutions:
Students must face a difficult task of working together without the chance to meet face to face and to get to know each other on a personal level. Working within a digital international setting necessitates an extensive preliminary stage, when the students come to know each other by introducing themselves in virtual conferences, discussing a set of specially prepared «personal» questions («icebreakers»), completing resume assignments to share with each other, and posting their photographs on their respective schools' websites. In addition, the students get information about their counterparts' cultures in general and their educational/research system in particular that allows them to better understand their foreign colleagues' status, interests and aspirations.

Essential for this stage is broad discussion of issues of intercultural communication based on literature accessible to the students from a dedicated website.[5] The aim of these class discussions is not so much to give an all-embracing picture of the other nation's culture (which is impossible within the short time allotted), as to make the students aware of the problem and thus help them face the difficulties that are inevitable in

their future work on the project. We supplement instruction and discussion of literature with a case study approach, asking the students to analyze cases on intercultural communication failures described in literature[6] and encouraging them to study and resolve problems arising in their own communication practices.

3.b. Problem: Differences in cultural expectation
Discussion and solutions:
The notion of political correctness is little known outside the United States and to many Europeans, appears to be artificial. But since it has become an essential part of American culture and language, non-American students need specific instruction in issues of political correctness relating to gender, race, nationality, etc. as well as linguistic expressions developed in these areas. At times, we also find that some American students from more conservative areas of the country, although familiar with the concept of political correctness, are reluctant to adjust to it and fail to see its applicability to their work. Discussion of this concept and clarifying its purpose and applicability in different contexts can be helpful to all students' understanding.

4. The difference between Western and Eastern learning and teaching styles is another problem to be considered in the Global Classroom. While «Germanic» (British, American, German, etc.) students are described as result-oriented, pragmatic, rational, and ready for collaborative work, Russian students demonstrate a higher reliance on memory[7] and a competitive attitude to learning. Western instruction is more learner-centered than Eastern; Russian students tend to be more dependent on the advice they get from their professors. Meshing different approaches to teaching and learning can be difficult.

4.a. Problem: Conflicting teaching and learning structures
Discussion and solutions:
By its very nature, the Global Classroom Project presupposes joint work. The effectiveness of collaborative pedagogy has been advocated since 1980s,[8] especially as far as web-based learning is concerned.[9] We view collaboration as «...much more than interacting, just negotiating with

others, or just consulting for others: It involves the production of at least one document, and all parties involved claim responsibility for all decisions made collectively, including those decisions concerned with documents produced from their collective efforts».[10] While American and Swedish students are accustomed to working in groups, Russian students find it psychologically hard to adapt to teamwork and sharing responsibilities in working on a joint project. To make things easier, we split the class into multinational groups of 5 to 7 students, who choose their specific part of project work. Within the group, students sign a contract stating the responsibilities of each member of the group. But even so, Russian students require a great deal of «coaching» on the part of their professors before they get used to a new learning/working environment.

4.b. Problem: Overcoming professor control
Discussion and solutions:

Once the class coursework is underway, the role of the teacher changes. The professors can no longer (and should not) control the students' activities; they stop being «instructors» and become «consultants» or «facilitators». As the group collaboration goes on, they evaluate the progress of groups and individual students by following discussions on WebBoard, listening to progress reports, and interacting with students in face-to-face classes. Ideally, the professors' physical presence in the classroom becomes redundant and the very notion of «class» loses its meaning since by and large discussions are asynchronous, while many specific questions are discussed via email. This process can happen more readily in the American part of the class, where all students have their own computers, but we hope that someday Russian students will also have daily access to their own computers and this type of learning environment can more fully develop for them, too. Eliminating instructor control over a class allows students the space to take responsibility for their work and allows for a more egalitarian setting, giving students the room to convey and support their own ideas, safe from epistemological or political agendae of their instructors. Students make their writing and content choices their own. At present, virtual classes cannot meet the needs of the Russian students, who are used to a teacher-led class and also require linguistic advice.

CONCLUSION: FAILURE IS SUCCESS. The title of this paragraph is not an attempt at George Orwell's «doublespeak». It is no secret that even the simplest, face-to-face communication can result in misunderstanding. Communication is chaotic by nature because there are multiple factors that affect it — personal, political, cultural, national, technological, to name but a few. The mere enumeration of problems related to intercultural, digital, asynchronous communication should create a picture of ultimate chaos. Because the nature of real-life communication is chaotic and sometimes requires difficult negotiation, in some cases, scholars in our field have declared failure or engaged in harsh self-criticism when trying to create real life learning forums for their students.[11] But it is precisely the understanding that chaos and disarray are elements of real communication that leads students to authentic learning.

What we are learning from the Global Classroom Project is that teaching web-based communication requires a mixture of all communication elements within contextual learning settings that change from semester to semester. Rather than asking students to learn «right» answers, we are asking them to experience difficult processes of analyzing and communicating cultural critiques developed through virtual cross-cultural connections. Students create functional communication in context, which by its nature, defies structured categorization or rule-based reasoning. The processes of teaching experiential communication as well as creating it are difficult, and often messy, and regularly defy the requirements of effective traditional, structured teaching. In the real world, the answers to problems are not always clear and «right» answers may only be approximated. Although most would find these circumstances both plausible and acceptable in assessing real communication, the expectation for classroom pedagogy is that it be clear, neat, and that it provides for effective, quick problem solving within a simply structured list of correct responses.

The incongruity between expectations for real world communication and class pedagogy can lead to a negative assessment of experiential class forums such as that of the Global Classroom Project. But the project causes us readjust our thinking about what a classroom should be and the pedagogical expectations that must be met. Where even attempting to take on a difficult and relatively inefficient communication structure in the workplace might imply failure, this kind of undertaking is precisely the core

of the Global Classroom Project, where students encounter difficult communication experiences in class contexts in order to avoid failure in other communication contexts. We create a forum of communication difficulties and students develop skills and strategies for overcoming them through real-life experience, and in doing so, just like their professors, they learn how to identify potential communication problems and even avoid them where possible. The need to leave room for some chaos and unanswered questions is inherent in communication teaching because it is in this space that new discoveries can be made and that individuals can experiment with communication styles that work for them and make them their own.

Effective cross-cultural, international communication requires a willingness to enter into a negotiatve process with others, keeping in mind the overall goals that will benefit all participants concerned rather than a narrow focus on the needs or desires of one of the represented international groups. This project has provided us with a forum for learning more about this communication process and its benefits and for making it possible for our students to experience the same. For this reason we continue to struggle with the chaos of the Global Classroom Project with the hope that we can discover solutions for cross-cultural communication that can lead to lasting benefit for students and instructors worldwide.

REFERENCES

[1] *Battalio J.* The Formal Report as Shared-Document Collaboration: A Plan for Co-Authorship. Technical Communication Quarterly. Spring 1993. Vol. 2. No. 2. P. 147–160.

[2] *Compare Hites J. M.* Design and delivery of training for international trainees: A case study // Performance Improvement Quarterly. 1996. No. 9 (2). P. 57–74.

[3] *Kovalskaya L. G.* Computer-Mediated Communication: A Virtual Dialogue // Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. 2002. № 1. <http://www. adygnet. ru/nauchrab/ Injaz/journal_abstract3. htm>

[4] *Boiarsky C.* The Relationship between Cultural and Rhetorical Conventions: Engaging in International Communication // Technical Communication Quarterly. Summer 1995. Vol. 4. No. 3. Pp. 245–259. P. 245.

[5] See for instance: Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication / Ed. M. J. Bennet. Intercultural Press, Inc., Yarmouth, 1998.

[6] Global Contexts. Case Study in International Technical Communication / Ed. D. S. Bosley. Allyn and Bacon: Boston, London, Toronto, 2001.

[7] *M. Labour* et al. Culture and Ethics // Online Tutoring E-Book / Ed. C. A. Higgson. <http://otis. scotcit. ac. uk/onlinebook>

[8] See for instance: *Clifford J.* Composing in Stages: The Effects of a Collaborative Pedagogy // Research in the Teaching of English. 1981. Vol. 15. P. 37–53; *Hill G. W.* Group versus Individual Performance: Are N + 1 Heads Better than One? // Psychological Bulletin. 1982. No. 91. P. 517–539; *O'Donnell Angela M.* et al. Cooperative Writing: Direct Effects and Transfer // Written Communication. 1985. Vol. 2. P. 307–315.

[9] *Kramer R., Bernhardt S. A.* Moving Instruction to the Web: Writing as Multi-Tasking // Technical Communication Quarterly. Summer 1999. Vol. 8. No. 3. P. 319–336.

[10] *Spilka Rachel.* Collaboration across Multiple Organizational Cultures // Technical Communication Quarterly. Spring 1993. Vol. 2. No. 2. Pp. 125–145. P. 128.

[11] *Allen N., Wickliff G. A.* Learning Up Close and at a Distance // Computers and Technical Communication: Pedagogical and Programmatic Perspectives / Ed. S. A. Selber. Greenwich, CT: Ablex, 1997. P. 201–218; *Spinuzzi C.* Pseudotransactionality, Activity Theory, and Professional Writing Instruction // Technical Communication Quarterly. Summer 1996. Vol. 5. No. 3. P. 295–307.