English for Academic Purposes

Ken Hyland

1. Introduction: What is EAP?

English for Academic Purposes is an approach to language education based on a close identification of the specific language features, discourse practices, and communicative skills of target academic groups, and which recognizes the particular subject-matter needs and expertise of learners (Hyland, 2006). It thus develops research-based pedagogies with the aim of assisting learners' study or research in English. While some work looks at the ways language relates to local disciplinary and institutional contexts and practices (e.g. Starfield, 2011; Swales, 1998) , EAP is typically understood as a text-oriented approach which explores the composition and structure of written and spoken discourse so that these can be made explicit to students. This emphasis on the analysis and description of the lexico-grammatical and rhetorical patterning of specialist spoken and written texts means that it links closely to the theme of this volume, fitting into the field of English Language Studies through a concern with exploring the production and analysis of texts created in English. This chapter will elaborate these comments, looking at some of the key ideas, influences and future directions in the field.

2. The emergence of EAP

EAP has emerged as a field of activity as English has established its grip as the international language of scholarly communication. countless students and academics around the world must now gain fluency in conventions of a relatively 'standardised' version of academic writing in English to understand their disciplines, to establish their careers or to successfully navigate their learning. The growth of the field has received a significant impetus more recently as a result of three major developments: The increased diversity of students entering universities in many countries as a result of widening access policies; the increased attention given to effective teaching by funding bodies as a result of the shift to a 'customer-service' view of higher education; and the incentives of offering English for Academic Purposes courses to fee paying students from around the world.

Accompanying these developments is the awareness that academic study presents considerable difficulties for many students. Recognizing that the communicative demands of the modern

university involve far more than simply controlling language errors or perfecting an "academic style", EAP quickly moved from an emphasis on science texts and the search for generic study skills. A developing research base, and an expanding range of publications and journals, has emphasised the heightened, complex, and highly diversified nature of communicative demands in modern university contexts. There is a growing awareness that students, including native speakers of English, have to take on new roles and engage with knowledge in new ways when they enter university (Lea & Street, 2000; Hyland, 2009). They find that they need to write and read unfamiliar genres and participate in novel speech events, and that communication practices are not uniform across academic disciplines but reflect different ways of constructing knowledge and engaging in teaching and learning. These experiences, moreover, have powerful influences on students understandings of their disciplines, their learning, and themselves (Hyland, 2012; Lillis, 2001).

In other words, EAP does not see students' difficulties as a linguistic deficit which can be topped up in a few language classes, but as their attempts to acquire a new literacy and, more broadly, new communicative practices. Engagement in forms of academic communication, as a student, teacher or researcher, involves new ways of behaving, interacting and thinking about the world. It is a 'social practice', rather than a skill, in that it is related both to what people do and to the wider social structures in which they do it. For EAP practitioners this means that they seek to accurately identify and describe the particular linguistic preferences, discourse features and communicative practices used in specific academic contexts so they can be taught to students and relayed to academics seeking to publish in English. Pedagogically, teaching practices attempt to offer systematic, locally managed approaches which draw on a number of central ideas, the most important of which I set out below before briefly touching on current areas of research.

3. Key issues and ideas

EAP draws from an eclectic theoretical foundation based around text-based forms of genre analysis, investigation of language using contexts and a commitment to research-based language education. At the core of EAP, however, are a few key ideas which includes needs analysis, disciplinary specificity, genre analysis and contextual analysis.

i Needs analysis

Needs analysis refers to the techniques for collecting and assessing information relevant to course design: it is the means of establishing the *how* and *what* of a course. While not unique to EAP, the use of systematic means to define the target discourses and practices that students require sits at the heart of both its research and teaching. Understood simply, the question 'what do these students need to know?' helps focus a language course and make it relevant for learners by taking the world outside

the language classroom into account. Needs data are mainly compiled using questionnaires, observations, tests, and text analyses, and draw on Dudley-Evans and St John's (1998) distinction between *Present situation* analysis and *Target situation* analysis. The former focuses on learners' current proficiencies and ambitions: what they can do and what they want at the beginning of the course; their skills and perceptions; their familiarity with the specialist subject; and what they know of its demands and genres. The latter concerns the linguistic skills and knowledge they need to perform competently in their disciplines and involves identifying the contexts of language use, observing the language events in these contexts, and collecting and analysing target genres.

The importance of needs analysis lays in recognizing the diversity of both students and disciplines and allowing teachers to be responsive to individual learners (e.g. Belcher, 2009). This cannot, however, ever be just an open-ended response to whatever is found in a target context and considerable work has gone on to identify what might be more over-arching and generic. In this respect, EAP conceptions of genre tend to draw on Systemic Functional conceptions of genre which seek to identify the ways language is used to perform broader functions such as *recount*, *description, report, explanation*, and so on (e.g. Macken-Horarik, 2002; Martin, 2002). 'Needs', moreover, is a slippery term and carries a misleading aura of technical precision and impartiality, suggesting that teachers can simply read off a course from the study of an objective situation. In fact, 'needs' is a construct which brings to bear the teacher's values, beliefs and philosophies of teaching and learning and therefore involves decisions about what to prioritize and what to exclude.

The concept has also been problematized and the question of "whose needs?" has been asked more critically, raising concerns about target goals and the interests they serve rather than assuming they should exclusively guide instruction. Benesch (2009) has introduced the term *rights analysis* to refer to a framework for studying power relations in classrooms and institutions and organizing students and teachers to bring about greater equality. More recently the scope of needs analysis has been further broadened to give greater attention to learner identity and how learners see themselves and who they want to become, both inside and outside academic contexts (Belcher & Lukkarila, 2011). One approach which has been recently suggested to collecting the perspectives of all the participants is that of 'critical ethnography' which encourages a holistic appreciation of the interrelationships between people and contexts and a dialogue of collaboration between those studied and those studying (Johns & Makalela, 2011).

An important spin off from needs analysis is the professionalization of teachers and the development of their abilities as researchers. The premise that language courses should take learners' target communicative contexts seriously has meant that teachers have always been suspicious of generic, commercially produced materials and courses. This has helped shrink the 'theory-practice divide' as

EAP practitioners cannot rely on intuitions about language, either their own or others', and have to become familiar with their students and the communicative contexts they are seeking to participate in. This in turn has led EAP practitioners to stress the desirability of working in tandem with members of students' fields, adding subject specialists' skills and knowledge to the their own expertise in communicative practices. This allows the topics, content, and texts of the profession to act as vehicles for teaching particular discourses and communicative skills. In this way needs analyses ensure that teaching is informed both by research and a healthy orientation to real-world applications and that, ideally, teachers are both critical of received wisdom and competent in text analysis.

ii disciplinary variation

EAP's commitment to contextual relevance means that it takes the notion of disciplinary-specific practices seriously. This corresponds with a community-oriented view of literacy (e.g. Barton & Hamilton, 1998) and recognizes that language is only effective when individuals use conventions that other members of the community find familiar and convincing. Essentially, we can see disciplines as language using communities and the term helps us join writers, texts and readers together. Disciplines combine something of the concept of *discourse community* (e.g. Swales, 1990), emphasising the texts and genre conventions of a group, and *community of practice* (Lave & Wenger, 1991) which focuses more on its activities and practices, including those that surround text production and use. There is, as in any discussion of collectivities, a danger of essentializing them, but studies of disciplinary texts shows remarkable inter-group similarities and intra-group variations in writing.

Communities provide the context within which students learn to communicate and to interpret each other's talk, gradually acquiring the specialized discourse competencies to participate as group members. The notion of discipline, however, like the notion of 'community', is not an altogether happy one, but while beset by challenges from post modernists, who see intellectual fragmentation at every turn, and from the emergence of practice-based and modular degrees, it is nevertheless a notion with remarkable persistence. Research shows, for instance, that the kinds of genres students have to write, the ways these are constructed, the style of lecture delivery, and the assessment practices they need to master all differ considerably across disciplines (Hyland, 2004; Hyland & Bondi, 2006) and across contexts, including year of study, Higher Education institution, course type, etc.

The idea of disciplinary variation assumes that academic discourse is embedded in the particular processes of argument, affiliation and consensus-making of disciplines as each discipline develops its own way of formulating and negotiating knowledge that is reflected in distinctive rhetorical preferences. One striking example is the ways writers report others' work, with the most common forms across the disciplines in a corpus of 240 research articles (30 papers from 10 leading journals in each field) shown in Table 1 (Hyland, 2004).

Table 1: Most frequent reporting verbs.

Discipline	Most frequent forms	Discipline	Most frequent forms
Philosophy	say, suggest, argue, claim	Biology	describe, find, report, show,
Sociology	argue, suggest, describe, discuss	Elec Eng.	Show, propose, report, describe
Applied Ling.	suggest, argue, show, explain	Mech Eng.	show, report, describe, discuss
Marketing	suggest, argue, demonstrate	Physics	develop, report, study

These preferences seem to reflect broad disciplinary purposes. So, the so-called 'soft' fields largely used verbs which refer to writing activities, like *discuss, hypothesize*, *suggest*, *argue* which involve the expression of arguments and allow writers to discursively explore issues while carrying a more evaluative element in reporting others' work. Engineers and scientists, in contrast, preferred verbs which point to the research itself like *observe*, *discover*, *show, analyse*, and *calculate*, which represent real world actions and so represent knowledge as proceeding from impersonal lab activities rather than from the interpretations of researchers.

This specificity is also apparent in the *kinds* of writing that students are asked to do as surveys showed back in the 1980s. In the humanities and social sciences, for example, analysing and synthesising multiple sources is important, while in science and technology, activity-based skills such as describing procedures, defining objects, and planning solutions are required. In fact, because different fields value different kinds of argument they set different writing tasks so that even students in fairly cognate fields, such as nursing and midwifery, are given very different writing assignments (Gimenez, 2009). Studies of assignment handouts and essay scripts underline reinforce this picture of diversity, as the structure of common formats such as lab reports can differ completely across different technical and engineering disciplines (Braine, 1995). Ethnographic case studies of individual students and courses also reveal marked diversities of tasks in different fields (eg Prior, 1998).

Clearly, writers in different fields represent themselves, their work and their readers in different ways, with those in the humanities and social sciences taking far more explicitly involved and personal positions than those in the science and engineering fields. This, in turn, impacts on the target genres and conventions of writing that learners are confronted with in their studies.

iii Genre analysis

In EAP genres are usually defined as staged, structured events using language designed to perform various communicative purposes by specific discourse communities (Swales, 2004). The term highlights the fact that effective texts are those which help readers or listeners recognise our purposes. Writers therefore anticipate what readers expect from a text and how they are likely to respond to it by

using the rhetorical conventions, interpersonal tone, grammatical features, argument structure, and so on that particular readers in particular fields are most likely to recognize. The use of genre analysis has therefore provided a useful tool for understanding community situated language use and describing the specific target texts expected of learners. The study of micro-elements of written and spoken academic texts, in fact, has grown into a cottage industry in the last decade, dominating research in the area and informing pedagogic materials (e.g. Swales & Feak, 2004).

Essentially, genre analysis seeks to reveal the ways that texts reflect and construct the communities that use them, as Swales (1998: 20) observes:

> In-group abbreviations, acronyms, argots, and other special terms flourish and multiply; beyond that, these discourse communities evolve their own conventions and traditions for such diverse verbal activities as running meetings, producing reports, and publicizing their activities. These recurrent classes of communicative events are the genres that orchestrate verbal life. These genres link the past and the present, and so balance forces for tradition and innovation. They structure the roles of individuals within wider frameworks, and further assist those individuals with the actualisation of their communicative plans and purposes.

The idea that people acquire, use, and modify texts while acting as members of academic, occupational, or social groups offers a powerful way of describing communities and understanding the communication needs of students in academic contexts.

EAP research into texts attempts to reveal how language works to accomplish goals by describing text stages and identifying salient features which allow effective engagement with others. Consequently a range of written academic genres have been studied in recent years. These include undergraduate essays (Bruce, 2010), student dissertations and theses (Petric, 2007), scientific letters (Hyland, 2004), and book reviews (Hyland & Diani, 2009), as well as various 'occluded' (Swales' term) or hidden, genres such as the MBA 'thought essay' (Loudermilk, 2007) and peer review reports on journal submissions (Fortenet, 2008). Research is also beginning to appear on the role of multimedia and electronic communication in academic writing focusing, for instance, on Computer Mediated Communication in distance learning (e.g. Coffin & Hewings, 2005) and the use of wikis (Myers, 2010).

iv Contextual analysis

Increasingly there has been a movement away from an exclusive focus on texts to the practices which surround their use, with researchers employing more qualitative methods to explore aspects of context. This has taken a number of forms, but has typically drawn on quasi-ethnographic studies to understand the conceptual frameworks of text users and on the analysis of textual sets and the ways

texts relate to each other in particular contexts. Ethnographic studies seek a local explanation of communicative behaviour by focusing on the ways members of discourse communities work, with detailed observations of behaviours, together with interviews and the analysis of texts, to provide a fuller picture of what is happening. Swales' (1998) "textography" and Johns' (1997) "students as researchers" work, indicates how ethnographic methods, such as observation of physical sites of genre activity and interviews with individuals who read or write a genre, can provide access to these communities and their genre use.

This type of research has been important in three main ways. First, it has provided valuable insights into target contexts, helping to identify the discursive practices involved in the production, distribution and consumption of texts. So, for example, this approach was used by Flowerdew and Miller (1996) to study L2 academic listening in Hong Kong. Second, ethnographic techniques have also been useful in exploring student practices, revealing how they participate in their learning, engage with their teachers, and experience their engagement as peripheral members of new communities. An excellent example of this kind of work is provided in Prior's (1998) studies of the disciplinary enculturation of graduate students through writing and their interactions with peers and professors. Third, ethnography has been used to highlight variations in cultural practices and to argue for pedagogies which are sensitive to local contexts, particularly where overseas students are studying in Anglo countries or where Anglo teachers and curricula are employed in overseas settings. Holliday's (1994) ethnographic study of a large scale EAP project in Egypt, for instance, underlines the need for curricula and methods which are appropriately responsive to local teaching models and expectations.

Another aspect of context lies in the ways that texts relate to other texts, forming 'constellations' with neighbouring genres. A useful concept here is that of 'genre sets' to refer to the part of the entire genre constellation that a particular individual or group engages in, either productively or receptively (Devitt, 1991). Textbooks, lab reports and lectures, for instance, may be key genres for many science students while discussion postings and on-line tutorials are genres more familiar to distance students on TESOL programmes. Genre constellations can be approached through 'genre chains', or how spoken and written texts cluster together in a given social activity.

One example of how an institutional genre is linked into a web of interdiscursivity is the undergraduate syllabus (Afros & Schryer, 2009) which is not only linked with other course documents and texts but also to wider understandings of the institution and the discipline itself. As the authors point out:

> The syllabus reveals that the social creation of knowledge taking place in the course
> draws on lectures, textbooks, and other in-class and out-of-class learning/teaching

activities as much as on the ongoing discussion in the academic field, adult education, university policies, and many other texts and communities. Instructors utilize the syllabus not only to manifest their membership in multiple discourse communities, but also to socialize students into (at least, some of) them.

Thus, the syllabus thus highlights the interdependences between the classroom, research, and institutional genres.

4. Current contributions and research

The key ideas sketched in the last section continue to influence the ways that research is conducted in EAP and the areas which receive most attention. Genre analysis, particularly forms which make use of specialised corpora tends to be the favoured approach in research, and also increasingly in teaching. A large body of this research work focuses on the role of interpersonal aspects of academic persuasion and on cultural and disciplinary variations in academic literacy practices.

i Interpersonal language use

In the last decade research has established that written academic texts are not the objective, faceless and impersonal form of discourse once supposed, but embody interactions between writers and readers. Academic writing is a persuasive endeavour where writers do not simply produce texts that plausibly represent an external reality, but as use language to acknowledge, construct and negotiate social relations. Rhetorical options help writers to offer a credible representation of themselves and their work by claiming solidarity with readers, evaluating their material and acknowledging alternative views. Considerable attention has turned to the features which help realise this interpersonal and evaluative dimension of academic texts under the general heading of 'evaluation' or 'Stance'. Essentially this is concerned with how the subjective presence of the writer or speaker intrudes into communication to convey an attitude to both those they address and the material they discuss. It involves the use of affect, mood and modality to position oneself in relation to a text and one's readers.

In academic writing a range of features which link text participants as *interactants* have been explored to reveal how writers adopt a persona and a tenor which is consistent with the norms of their fields. One such feature is *evaluative that* (Hyland & Tse, 2005), a structure which allows a writer to thematize evaluative meanings by presenting a complement clause following *that* (as in *We believe that this is an interesting construction*). Other recent studies have looked at circumstance adverbials in student presentations (Zareva, 2009), modal verbs and stance adverbs in undergraduate lectures and textbooks (Biber, 2006), conditional clauses in articles (Warchał, 2010) and how authors manage a relationship with readers by glossing and exemplifying potentially unfamiliar concepts in research articles (Hyland, 2007). All of these features in some way address the idea of 'positioning',

or adopting a point of view to both the issues discussed in the text and to others who hold points of view on those issues, and have been helpful in identifying and rendering explicit to second language writers for instance, the pragmatic effects of different rhetorical options when they engage with their readers (e.g. Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011).

Various frameworks have been proposed to explore the linguistic features of intersubjective positioning. The *Appraisal* model (Martin & White, 2005), for example, seeks to catalogue the resources available in English for conceding, averring, attributing, hedging, boosting and otherwise modalising the status of an utterance, using Systemic Linguistics to represent the writer's attitude or opinion towards the propositions he or she is setting out. Another model is *Stance and Engagement* (Hyland, 2005a) which attempts to capture how discoursal choices help construct both writers and readers. *Stance* is an attitudinal dimension which includes features which refer to the ways writers present themselves and convey their judgements, opinions, and commitments while *Engagement* is an alignment dimension where writers acknowledge and connect to their readers, pulling them along with their argument, focusing their attention, acknowledging their uncertainties, including them as discourse participants. Finally, *Metadiscourse*, (Hyland, 2005b; Hyland & Tse, 2004) offers a more comprehensive and integrated way of examining interaction in academic argument, broadening the scope of interactional resources to also include features such as conjunctions, framing devices, and glosses on content.

ii Disciplinary variation research

Research also continues to reveal the considerable differences in rhetorical preferences of the disciplines, seeking to explain differences in speaker and writer choices in terms of their particular social and epistemological practices.

Perhaps most obviously, the vocabulary that students have to gain familiarity with to function in their fields varies enormously, but this specialist language is not simply disciplinary jargon, but is central to learning disciplinary knowledge as it involves adopting technical terms at the same time as coming to terms with the abstract dimension of the discourse (Woodward-Kron, 2008). More unexpectedly, perhaps, is the fact that many so-called 'semi-technical' lexical items such as *process, vary, analyze* and *function* differ enormously across academic domains in their frequency, use and meanings, often collocating with disciplinary-specific concepts to transform them into highly specialised terms (Hyland & Tse, 2007). As mentioned above, moreover, other features have been shown to vary. Table 2, for example, shows how, in the corpus of 240 research articles in eight fields mentioned above, various features used to engage readers explicitly, such as expressions of attitude and questions, are far more common in the 'soft' domains.

Table 2: Interpersonal by discipline (per1,000 words)

	Phil	Soc	AL	Mk	Phy	Bio	ME	EE	Total
Hedges	18.5	14.7	18.0	20.0	9.6	13.6	8.2	9.6	14.5
Self Mention	5.7	4.3	4.4	5.5	5.5	3.4	1.0	3.3	4.2
Questions	1.4	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.5
Attitude Markers	8.9	7.0	8.6	6.9	3.9	2.9	5.6	5.5	6.4

Hedges, for example, indicate the degree of confidence the writer thinks it might be wise to give a claim while opening a space for readers to dispute interpretations and these are twice as common in the discursive fields of philosophy, sociology, applied linguistics and marketing than in the science and engineering fields. The fact that there is less control of variables, more diversity of research outcomes, and fewer clear bases for accepting claims than in the sciences means that writers can't report research with the same confidence of shared assumptions, so papers rely far more on recognizing alternative voices. Arguments have to be expressed more cautiously by using more hedges. Self mention is also as it indicates the perspective from which statements should be interpreted and distinguishes the writer's own work from that of others. Contrary to the rhetorical preferences of the hard sciences, where writers typically downplay their personal role to highlight the phenomena under study, the replicability of research activities, and the generality of the findings, self mention emphasizes an individual contribution while seeking agreement for it.

These results refer to a corpus of research articles, but recent studies also show disciplinary specificity in how authors construct genres such as journal descriptions (Hyland & Tse, 2009), masters' theses (Samraj, 2008) and websites (Hyland 2011).

iii Cultural variation of academic writing

Research has also pointed to cultural specificity in rhetorical preferences (e.g. Connor, 2011). Although *culture* remains a controversial term, if we see it an historically transmitted and systematic network of meanings which allow us to understand, develop and communicate our knowledge and beliefs about the world, then it is inextricably bound up with language. Although it is far from conclusive (e.g. Atkinson, 2004), analytic research suggests that the schemata of L2 and L1 writers differ in their preferred ways of organising ideas which can influence academic writing.

Cultural factors therefore have the potential to influence perception, language, learning, and communication and these conclusions have been supported by a range of studies over the past decade. Many of these have compared the features of research articles by writers of different languages such as Italian (e.g. Molino, 2010), Chinese (e.g. Chek, 2010) and Spanish (e.g. Soler, 2011), largely

focusing on research articles, but also noting differences in student essays (Kubota, 1998) and conference abstracts (Yakhontova, 2002). While we cannot simply predict the ways people are likely to write on the basis of assumed cultural traits, or infer 'culture' from language use, discourse studies have shown that students' first language and prior learning come to influence ways of organising ideas and structuring arguments when writing in English at university.

This research draws attention to the fact that students (and academics) are members of several cultures simultaneously and critically highlights the conflicts inherent in these multiple memberships. In particular it emphasises the potential clashes between the discourse conventions of academic and ethnic cultures. The question of who establishes the linguistic conventions of disciplinary communities and whose norms are used to judge them is a central issue in EAP and researchers have questioned the traditional view that those familiar with other conventions need to conform to Anglo-American norms when engaging in professional, and particularly academic, genres (eg Mauranen, 2012). Many post-colonial countries have developed thriving indigenous varieties of English which are widely used and accepted locally but which diverge from what some would define as international standards. EAP teachers now take the issue of the definition of so-called appropriate models for EAP seriously, exploring how far the professions, corporations and disciplines in which they work tolerate differences in rhetorical styles.

5. Future directions

While text research will continue to inform pedagogy in EAP for the foreseeable future, current lines of inquiry into genres such as the academic articles and theses are reaching saturation point. Consequently research is beginning to follow a number of new directions.

First, we may expect greater attention given to research which helps untangle the rhetorical complexities of the modern academy. Many student genres, such as counselling case notes, reflexive journals and clinical reports, remain to be described while analyses of more occluded research process genres would greatly assist novice writers in the publication process. We also know little about the ways that genres form 'constellations' with neighbouring genres nor about the 'genre sets' that a particular individual or group engages in, nor how spoken and written texts cluster together in a given social activity. In addition, the interdisciplinary mix of academic subjects now taken by students impact on the genres they have to participate in, compounding the challenges of writing in the disciplines with novel literacy practices that have barely been described.

Second, research is needed to identify more precisely the notion of 'community' and how it relates to discipline and the discoursal conventions that these routinely employ. Nor is it yet understood how

our memberships of different groups influence our participation in academic discourses. For now, the term *discipline* might be seen as a shorthand form for the various identities, roles, positions, relationships, reputations, reward systems and other dimensions of social practices constructed and expressed through language in the academy, but these concepts need to be refined through the analyses of academic texts and contexts. Such research, of course, will also say something about identity and the ways that individuals participate in communities (Hyland, 2012).

Third, it is likely that research into the role of multimodal and electronic texts in academics settings will increase. Academic texts, particularly in the sciences, have always been multimodal, but textbooks, websites and articles are now far more heavily influenced by graphic design than ever before and the growing challenge to the page by the screen as the dominant medium of communication means that images are ever more important in meaning-making. Precisely how resources such as hypertext links, graphics and animated displays are organised for maximum effect and how they interact with text in research and pedagogic contexts are key research issues.

6 Conclusions

EAP is a body of practices based around the idea that learning is an induction into a new culture rather than an extension of existing skills. The language competencies required by university study may grow out of those which students practice in school, but require them to understand the ways language constructs and represent knowledge in particular areas. In the classroom this has taken the form of a shift from how language is used in isolated written or spoken texts towards contextualised communicative genres and an increasing preoccupation with identifying strategies suitable for both native and non-native speakers of the target language. Together these studies help capture something of the ways language is used in the academy, producing a rich vein of findings which continues to inform both teaching and our understanding of the practices of professional and academic communities.

References

Afros, E & Schryer, C.F. (2009). The genre of syllabus in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes.* 8, 3: 224-233

Atkinson, D. (2004). Contrasting rhetorics/contrasting cultures: why contrastive rhetoric needs a better conceptualization of culture *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3, 4: 277-289.

Barton, D. & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies*. London: Routledge.

Belcher, D. (2009). What ESP is and can be: an introduction. In Belcher, D. (ed.) *English for Specific Purposes in Theory and practice*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. pp 1-20

Belcher, D. & Lukkarila, L. (2011). Identity in the ESP context: putting the learner front and centre in needs analysis. In Belcher, D et al (eds.). pp 73-93.

Belcher, D. Johns, M. Paltridge, B. (eds). (2011*). New directions in English for Specific Purposes research.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Benesch, S. (Ed.). (2009). Special edition: Critical English for academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*(2).

Biber, D. (2006). *University language: a corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Braine, G. (1995). 'Writing in the natural sciences and engineering'. In D. Belcher and G. Braine (eds), *Academic Writing in a Second Language: Essays on Research and Pedagogy* (pp. 113-34). New Jersey: Ablex.

Chang, P. & Schleppegrell, M. (2011) Taking an effective authorial stance in academic writing: Making the linguistic resources explicit for L2 writers in the social sciences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,*10, 3, *140-151*

Chek, K. L. (*2010)* Research article introductions in Chinese and English: A comparative genre-based study *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9, 4,*: *267-279*

Coffin, C. & Hewings, A. (2005). Engaging Electronically: Using CMC to Develop Students' Argumentation Skills in Higher Education. *Language and Education*, 19, 1: 32 – 49

Connor, U. (2011) . *Intercultural rhetoric in the writing classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Devitt, A. (1991). Intertextuality in tax accounting. in C. Bazerman, & J. Paradisi (eds.), *Textual dynamics of the professions* (pp. 336-57). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M.-J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Flowerdew, J., & Miller, L. (1996). Lectures in a second language: notes towards a cultural grammar. *English for Specific Purposes, 15*(2), 121-140.

Fortanet, I. (2008). *Evaluative language in peer review referee reports. Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 7, 1: *27-37*

Gimenez, J. (2009). Beyond the academic essay: Discipline-specific writing in nursing and midwifery. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 7 (3): 151-164.

Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.21-22).

Hyland, K. (2004) *Disciplinary Discourses.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2005a). 'Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse'. *Discourse Studies,* 6(2), 173-91.

Hyland, K. (2005b). *Metadiscourse*. London, Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. London, England: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2007). Applying a gloss: exemplifying and reformulating in academic discourse. *Applied Linguistics.* 28: 266-285

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse*. London: Continuum

Hyland, K. (2011). The presentation of self in scholarly life: identity and marginalization in academic homepages. *English for Specific Purposes* 30 (4): 286-297.

Hyland, K. (2012). *Disciplinary identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Bondi, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Academic discourse across disciplines*. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

Hyland, K. & Diani, G. (Eds). (2009). *Academic evaluation: review genres in university settings.* London: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Hyland, K. and Tse, P. (2004). 'Metadiscourse in academic writing: a reappraisal'. Applied Linguistics, 25(2), 156-77.

Hyland, K. & Tse, P. (2005). *Evaluative that* constructions: signalling stance in research abstracts. *Functions of Language.* 12 (1): 39-64

Hyland, K. and Tse, P. (2007). 'Is there an "academic Vocabulary"?' *TESOL Quarterly*,41(2), 235-54.

Hyland, K. & Tse, P. (2009) "The leading journal in its field": Evaluation in journal descriptions. *Discourse Studies*.

Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, role and context: Developing academic literacies*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Johns, A. & Makalela, L. (2011). Needs analysis, critical ethnography and context: perspectives from the client and the consultant. In Belcher et al (eds). pp197-221.

Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, 17. 295-306.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge: CUP.

Lea, M. and Street, B. V. (2000). 'Student writing and staff feedback in higher education'. In M. Lea, and B. Stierer (eds), *Student Writing in Higher Education: New Contexts* (pp. 32-46). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Lillis, T. (2001). *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, Desire*. London: Routledge.

Loudermilk, B. (2007). Occluded academic genres: An analysis of the MBA Thought Essay. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *6, 3*: *190-205*

Macken-Horarik, M. (2002). "Something to shoot for": A Systemic Functional approach to teaching genre in secondary school science. In Johns, A. (ed.). *Genre in the classroom: multiple perspectives.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum. pp 17-42.

Martin, J. (2002). A universe of meaning. How many practices? In Johns, A. (ed.). *Genre in the classroom: multiple perspectives.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum. pp 269-78

Martin, J. and White, P. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave/MacMillan.

Mauranen, A. (2012) *Exploring ELF. Academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Molino A. (2010) Personal and impersonal authorial references: A contrastive study of English and Italian Linguistics research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9, 2*: *86-101*

Myers, G. (2010). *The discourse of blogs and wikis*. London: Continuum.

Petrić, B. (2007). Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 6, 3: *238-253*

Prior, P. (1998) *Writing/disciplinarity: a sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Samraj, B. (2008) A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines with a focus on introductions *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 1: 55-67

Soler, V. (2011). Comparative and contrastive observations on scientific titles written in English and Spanish *English for Specific Purposes*, *30, 2*: *124-137*

Starfield, S. (2011). *Doing critical ethnographic research into academic writing: the theory of the methodology*. In Johns, Paltridge & Belcher, D. (eds.). pp 174-196.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis.* New York: CUP.

Swales, J. (1998). *Other floors, other voices: A textography of a small university building.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres.* New York: CUP.

Swales, J., & Feak, C. (2000). *Academic writing for graduate students: essential tasks and skills 2nd ed*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Warchał, K. (2010). Moulding interpersonal relations through conditional clauses: Consensus-building strategies in written academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9, 2*: *140-150.*

Woodward-Kron, R. *(2008)*. More than just jargon – the nature and role of specialist language in learning disciplinary knowledge *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7, 4*: *234-249*

Yakhontova, T. (2002). ' "Selling" or "telling"? The issue of cultural variation in research genres'. In J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic Discourse* (pp. 216-32). London: Longman.

Zareva, A. (2009). Informational packaging, level of formality, and the use of circumstance adverbials in L1 and L2 student academic presentations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 8, 1: 55-68.

Further reading

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic Discourse.* London, Continuum.
A non-technical orientation to a wide range of spoken and written research, instructional, student and popular academic genres including, lectures, textbooks, research papers and popular science articles.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An advanced resource book*. London, Routledge.
An introductory coursebook covering a wide range of topics in English for Academic Purposes with readings, tasks and accessible discussions of key areas and controversies.

Johns, A., Paltridge, B. & Belcher, D. (eds.) (2011). *New Directions in ESP*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. A wide ranging edited volume covering central themmes in current research and research methodologies.

Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
A rich, thoughtful and accessible account of research genres focusing on key issues of analysis and pedagogy.