STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION
2020, VOL. 45, NO. 3, 579–591
https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1576165

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The Academic Literacies approach to scholarly writing: a view through the lens of the ESP/Genre approach

Lynne Flowerdew

Department of Applied Linguistics and Communication, Birkbeck, University of London, London, UK

ABSTRACT

I first briefly review two paradigms for scholarly writing, namely the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and Academic Literacies (Ac Lits) approaches. ESP has traditionally been considered as the dominant paradigm and Ac Lits as somewhat on the margins of academic writing theory and practice. My aim in this article is to illustrate which areas and methodologies from ESP, especially corpus-based techniques, could usefully inform Ac Lits. The findings from corpus-based studies on the research article genre can reveal authorial voice, power relations, identity construction, as well as cross-cultural and cross-linguistic features, important issues raised in the Ac Lits literature. Corpus research has also been useful in revealing the academic values inscribed in text through recurrent lexico-grammatical patterns. Corpus linguistic techniques, at present largely absent from Ac Lits methodologies, could be considered to supplement the various ethnographic approaches associated with Ac Lits.

KEYWORDS

ESP; Academic Literacies; genre; corpus; ethnography; critical

Introduction

Two paradigms for scholarly writing are the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and Academic Literacies (Ac Lits) approaches. They are usually seen as dichotomous with their different epistemologies and ways of viewing the world. ESP has traditionally been seen as the dominant paradigm and Ac Lits occupying a more marginal position in the field of scholarly writing, although this position is now changing. More recently, writing researchers and practitioners have usefully reviewed the two approaches in a quest to find common ground, providing careful, measured critiques of their respective theoretical and philosophical underpinnings and applications to writing in higher education contexts (see Wingate 2015). There are some noticeable differences between the two approaches, as outlined below.

The Ac Lits paradigm draws its theoretical underpinnings from the 'New Literacy School' (see Barton 1994; Street 1984), inspiring the foundations of a practice-oriented perspective in a seminal work by Lea and Street (1998). This study has been taken up and expanded in the work of Lillis and Curry (2010) and Lillis (2006, 2013). In the Ac Lits tradition, writing is seen as a form of 'social practice' (rather than as simply a text-based construct) influenced by epistemologies of particular disciplines, where factors such as power relations and student identities come into play. The value of ethnography in building up a picture of people, places and resources in which academic texts are created is emphasised. The Ac Lits approach to academic writing mainly focused on British 'non-traditional' students in higher education in the UK (see Lillis 2001), but is increasingly being taken up in

CONTACT Lynne Flowerdew flowerdewlynne@gmail.com Department of Applied Linguistics and Communication, Birkbeck, University of London

other areas, notably writing for research publication purposes (see Curry and Lillis 2013; Lillis and Curry 2010).

The ESP/Genre approach has a longer history than Ac Lits, with the theoretical foundation laid in the 1960s by the seminal work of Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens (1964) in the areas of register and genre analysis. Advancing and fleshing out the concept of genre, Swales's seminal publication on article introductions in the 1980s propelled genre theory and its application to analysis of ESP texts into the limelight. Genre specialists, in short, define a genre according to the overarching communicative purpose of a text, looking at how the relationship between the discourse community, its participants and communicative context influence the rhetorical patterning of text. Ethnographic methods are often used to understand academic discourse from a socially-situated perspective; however, the text still plays a central role unlike in the Ac Lits approach with its focus on practices. Corpus linguistic methodologies are increasingly being used to investigate rhetorical patterning of text, a methodology largely absent from Ac Lits work. There now exists a wealth of literature on the application of genre analysis in ESP academic writing contexts, most often associated with the teaching of academic writing to speakers of other languages in higher education both in the UK and across other parts of the globe, building on Swales's landmark publications in the field (Swales 1990, 2004), such that ESP and genre have become practically synonymous.

A few scholars have sought to mesh the theory and practice underpinning both academic writing fields. For example, Paltridge, Starfield, and Tardy (2016) draw together work in the areas of academic literacies, genre studies and writing in the disciplines, making a case for ethnographically-oriented writing research and pedagogy by building on and extending Lillis's (2008) work on ethnography as method, methodology and deep theorising as a way of gaining insights into the contexts in which academic texts are produced. Meanwhile, Wingate and Tribble (2012) argue that Ac Lits and ESP/Genre share much common ground, pointing out that both are concerned with understanding the epistemological, cultural and linguistic aspects of a new knowledge community, although Ac Lits practitioners have objected to their collapsing of the two fields (see Lillis and Tuck 2016). Likewise, Hathaway (2015) makes a strong case for bringing together Ac Lits and ESP approaches to teaching academic writing.

In spite of attempts by a few scholars to articulate convergences between the two domains, some aspects of the ESP/Genre approach have come under fire from the Ac Lits camp (see Lillis and Tuck 2016, 36–37). In short, in ESP the text tends to be the key object of exploration with a tendency towards reification whereas textual conventions are always contested/able in Ac Lits in which the producer or meaning-maker is the focus. In ESP the status of English is assumed to be 'native speaker', a concept challenged in Ac Lits as well as the dichotomy between novice and expert writers. It is therefore no surprise that Lillis and Scott (2007, 29) describe the ESP orientation to pedagogy as a 'normative' one through 'academic socialisation' in contrast to the 'transformative' orientation associated with Ac Lits. A corpus search on the terms 'transformative' and 'normative' of case studies in Ac Lits (see Lillis et al. 2015) bears out this philosophy with 190 counts recorded for 'transformative' and 67 for 'normative'. In their response to these critiques, Wingate and Tribble (2012, 488) take issue with both the imprecise definition of 'academic socialisation' and its portrayal, expressing the view that, based on a close reading of the literature 'In whatever way Academic Literacies proponents may understand academic socialisation, they have tended to project a narrative of a narrow, prescriptive initiation into literacy conventions onto approaches which explicitly teach the characteristics of writing in particular genres and disciplines'. They continue this line of argument by questioning whether 'textual bias', as claimed by Lillis and Scott (2007, 11), can be equated with a 'normative' approach, and take issue with presentation of the Academic Literacies model as 'transformative', situated within the wider context of academic writing and allowing students to express their voice and identities.

In sum, the somewhat negative press that the ESP/Genre approach has received from the Ac Lits camp has no doubt spurred Wingate and Tribble to comment as follows:

> Along with Swales (2009), we hold that the Academic Literacies theorists have tended to offer an insufficiently nuanced account of what they characterise as EAP, and have, thereby, ignored or marginalised important contributions that have been made in this field … Is it not the case, rather, that the substantial body of research and practice which has been developed in ESP/Genre is something which should be drawn on rather than ignored? (487)

My key purpose in this paper is to take up the rhetorical challenge issued by Wingate and Tribble to offer some thoughts on why the substantial body of research and practice which has been developed in Genre/ESP, especially accounts of a corpus-based nature, should be accorded due consideration and reflection rather than brushed aside by Ac Lits proponents. I will concentrate on three significant areas in the Genre/ESP literature: (1) corpus-based research on academic genres, (2) genre-based, corpus-informed pedagogy, and; (3) process approaches to explicit genre-based instruction. These will be discussed with reference to some key themes in the recent Ac Lits-related literature (Lillis 2013; Lillis and Curry 2010), which I feel its proponents can profitably make use of in future theorising and practice.

Corpus-based research on academic genres: voice, power relations, intercultural rhetoric and identity

In discussing form-functional analyses, Lillis (2013, 48) cites Hyland's (2002) analysis of self-reference in a 1.3-million-word corpus of research articles across different disciplinary texts, which were then mapped onto specific functions such as *stating a goal, explaining self-benefits* etc. Lillis notes that Hyland concluded from his follow-up comparative analysis of this data with data derived from a corpus of student reports that less experienced writers are confronted by greater challenges in claiming authority in their academic writing. Lillis states that 'An important point to note here is that in order to reach such conclusions, Hyland draws not only on textual analysis but also on interviews with writers' (45). Like Hyland, Wharton (2012) also included an ethnographic dimension to her analysis of interpersonal stance markers based on a small corpus of L2 undergraduate writing in response to a data description task in the discipline of statistics. Five categories of stance in assertions were investigated: bare, hedged, vague, boosted and reader-inclusive. Wharton's follow-up interview with a specialist informant from the Science Department served to elucidate ways in which the students' deployment of stance resources was, or was not, appropriate in light of disciplinary epistemologies. For instance, Wharton initially interpreted reader-inclusive stances, e.g. *We can see that …* as having some type of boosting function. However, the specialist informant thought that this use may be an inappropriate transfer of language used in their lectures by a teacher commenting on a graph projected on a screen and that this pragmatic use as an engagement marker would not be an appropriate voice in a student answer.

Lillis thus quite rightly underscores the important role that a more social constructivist perspective can play in the interpretation of corpus data, as also recognised by Flowerdew (2015b). However, she somewhat overstates the point, which does not do full justice to the power of more quantitative findings. Stubbs (2001) provides corpus evidence to show that when one is dealing with multiple texts from a particular discourse community with somewhat institutionalised practices it may be possible to 'read off' pragmatic inferences from the *accumulation* of corpus data, aided by more qualitative analyses. Koutsantoni's (2006) corpus analysis of engineering research articles and research theses provides evidence of how power relations are inscribed in text, realised through the use of strategic hedges, i.e. hedges acknowledging various kinds of limitations. The quantitative and qualitative analyses show that students hedge more than expert authors, seeming to be unwilling to make use of this rhetorical strategy, most probably reflecting their awareness of power asymmetries existing between them and their examiners. 'Power relations' is a familiar trope in the work of Ac Lits theorists. Taking a corpus-based perspective on power relations would provide further verification for the differential power relations Lillis and Curry (2010) have noted through their individual case

studies on rhetorical/literacy practices as privileging English-centre scholars against those writing from the non-Anglophone periphery.

Contrastive rhetoric is another area touched on by Ac Lits theorists, but it is judged somewhat harshly, in my view (see Lillis 2013, 67). The references are selective with a focus on Kubota's critical contrastive rhetoric stance (see Kubota 2010; Kubota and Lehner 2004) and there is no mention of Connor's later work in which she has sought to address Kubota's concerns (see Connor 2011, 2013). Moreover, the field has since been reconceptualised as 'intercultural rhetoric' to disengage it from stereotyping and disadvantaging writers from the non-Anglophone sphere. While linguistic and text analyses continue to be the basis of analysis, Connor stresses that these should be accompanied by ethnographic methods to examine the socio-cultural contexts in which texts are created. And one cannot neglect the important role that corpus analysis plays in shedding light on cross-linguistic and cross-cultural features, as observed in the corpus studies on intercultural rhetoric by Mur Dueñas (2009) and Pérez-Llantada (2014a, 2014b). In Mur Dueñas's (2009) interpretation of the findings from a three-way comparison of logical markers (additive, contrastive, consecutive) in L1 English and Spanish and L2 business management research articles, she explains the divergences in terms of the different ways in which information is presented in the two languages and sociocultural contexts. It was found that in the two English sub-corpora scholars tend to organise their results by contrasting those which support their hypothesis stated in the introduction with those that do not, and also contrast their arguments to those made in the previous literature or research. Mur Dueñas concludes that the varying discourse pattern of the international texts in English vs. the Spanish ones could be related to the different contexts of publication, i.e. national (local, restricted) vs. international (competitive, diverse) setting up a different reader-writer relationship. It would thus seem that the corpus studies by Mur Dueñas and others would have relevance for Lillis and Curry's work on multilingual scholars writing for different communities (Lillis and Curry 2010, Ch. 2, 31–60) and also identity construction.

In this respect, Dahl's (2004) corpus study of textual metadiscourse, examining how academic writers leave traces of themselves, i.e. their 'identities' in their writing, is also of interest. This study, part of a larger-scale study (see Fløttum, Dahl, and Kinn 2006), takes a double contrastive approach by including both language/national culture (English, French, Norwegian) and disciplines (economics, linguistics, medicine), thereby enabling Dahl to see whether 'academic writing traditions are more firmly rooted in the author's native writing culture or whether they are more closely related with the disciplinary culture he or she belongs to' (1809). Dahl found that in the discipline of medicine all three languages displayed a uniform pattern of little use of metatext, which she explained by way of the global implementation of the IMRD (Introduction-Method-Result-Discussion) structure in which the research data can be said to exist outside the texts. In contrast, Dahl argues that as economics and linguistics have a less formalised research article text structure than medicine and often display their findings through argumentation presented within the text by individual authors, language/national culture will be more important than in medicine. Dahl underscores the generic tight structuring of medical reporting where the content is presented in a given sequence, i.e. the IMRD structure (Swales 1990), which has had a profound influence on ESP research and pedagogy. Linguistics and economics articles in English and Norwegian used much more metatext than those in French, leading Dahl to conclude that English and Norwegian represent writer-responsible cultures whereas French represents a reader-responsible culture.

Identity construction is a contested space in the academy, as signalled by the work of Ivanič (1998) and Lillis (2001) who take a critical stance on the issue, arguing that students have the right to maintain their own individual writing identity even though this may transgress the norms of disciplinary writing. However, it is suggested that Ac Lits, while privileging social practice and ethnographic approaches focusing on unique, individual writing experiences, could also usefully benefit from engagement with the more 'accommodationist' corpus-based work on disciplinary and cultural identity. As Hyland (2012) has pointed out there is both 'commonality' and 'individuality' in construal of identity in disciplinary discourses. Both deserve to be taken into account.

Genre-based, corpus-informed pedagogy: a pragmatic perspective

Johns (2011) has pointed out that instructional decisions on genre-based academic writing are by no means clear cut and may be related to a writing tutor's ideology as to whether to foster explicit genre learning, as in the ESP genre-based tradition, or the raising of students' genre awareness more implicitly, associated with the Rhetorical Genre Studies approach. Adherents of this approach tend to privilege the social and ideological context but at the same time do not neglect rhetorical organisation and linguistic features; Devitt (2009a) eloquently argues that genre necessarily encompasses form, whereby a contextualised treatment embeds form into its individual, social and cultural contexts. The Academic Literacies pedagogic model has much in common with the Rhetorical Genre Studies approach with a concern for the development of students' *critical* awareness (Devitt 2009b). Lea (2004) outlines how a set of Ac Lits principles, taking into account students' backgrounds, identities and institutional power relations, can be embedded within learning materials in a distance learning course. A key tenet of this approach is to give students an opportunity for challenging 'dominant literacy practices' (Lillis 2006, 34), thus reflecting the critical EAP stance espoused by Benesch (2001). However,Wingate (2012) underlines the inherent pitfalls in this approach:

> It is difficult to see, however, how students would be able to challenge practices before they have fully understood them. As the literacy practices of disciplines are manifested in texts, it seems that the analysis of texts must either precede the analysis of practices, or at least be the main focus of instruction. (Wingate 2012, 28)

Parkinson (2016) concurs with Wingate on this matter. She argues that even though students are required to write in ways that may seem foreign to them, for example, by assuming the identity of 'write like a scientist', writing tutors might feel that this approach is somewhat alienating. Also, it may be doing students a disservice to not acculturate them into disciplinary practices, especially as written text is the main assessment tool (Tribble and Wingate 2013). And what about students' voices on this issue? Wingate (2012), cited in Parkinson (2016), found that in her study evaluating three different approaches to teaching academic writing to undergraduate students in a range of disciplines, students concentrated on accommodating to the norms of disciplinary discourses rather than critiquing them. As noted by Parkinson (2016), it is customary for exemplars of disciplinary texts such as lab reports to be used for illuminating prototypical move structure patterning in the ESP tradition of genre-based teaching. At the same time, she also acknowledges the importance of ethnographic investigations for revealing disciplinary ideologies and reader-writer roles, aspects also embodied in the Ac Lits approach.

A text-based focus allows students to master a genre through familiarisation with the academic values and conventions of a particular expert community, which, in turn, are realised through specific lexico-grammatical patterning. Moreover, corpus linguistic methodologies have been of great help in revealing academic values and conventions through identification of recurrent lexico-grammatical patterns foregrounding what is typical of a genre. Giannoni's (2010) corpus-based study examines disciplinary academic values in the research article. The linguistic means by which academic values and conventions are realised by the lexico-grammar have also been the focus of corpus-based pedagogy (see Charles 2007; Parkinson 2013). For example, Charles (2007) reports an initiative specifically designed to familiarise doctoral students with the two-part rhetorical device of anticipated criticisms and writer's defence, a key rhetorical strategy for addressing potential criticisms / limitations of their research. One of the concordance tasks required students to retrieve *while* in sentence intitial position with the context terms *appear*/seem*/ may*. This search generated the two-part pattern: anticipated criticism → defence and its realisation using signals of apparent concession, contrast and justification, as in the following:

> *Anticipated criticism*: **While I acknowledge** that in some cases the distinction between institutions and groups **may** seem rather arbitrary, Writer's defence: such political actor subjects are not the focus of interest in this thesis. (Charles 2007, 294)

Students were then asked to conduct a search for *while* within a sentence rather that at sentence-initial position, which generated far fewer concordance lines, and discuss why this might be so. By using *while* in sentence-initial position 'the writer downgrades the importance of the conceded proposition and puts the emphasis instead on the information in the main clause which counters the concession and provides the justification for the writer's view' (Charles 2007, 294). Another pedagogic initiative in a similar vein is that by Flowerdew (2015a) who made use of a corpus of research articles for examining phraseologies typically associated with rhetorical functions in the Discussion section of theses, one of which concerned addressing limitations of the study. The author expected that the third conditional, i.e. a counterfactual, would be one of the grammatical devices for realising this function. However, a corpus search on the bigram '*if/would*' revealed that the second conditional instead of third conditional tended to be used for signalling limitations, most probably as a means of strategically downplaying them, e.g. '*Also our design would be more objective if the exact final outcome analyses were fully specified, but this would be very difficult in the context of…* '. Dontcheva-Navratilova (2012) has underscored the importance of corpus-based frequency analysis for revealing the discourse properties of grammar, and the corpus searches devised by Charles (2007) and Flowerdew (2015a) exemplify how this can be applied to ESP pedagogy. Such methods can also uncover *non-obvious meaning* (Partington, Duguid, and Taylor 2013), as evidenced by the use of the second conditional for signalling limitations of a study.

Of note is that this pedagogy takes as its uncontested authority, as it were, a corpus of successful doctoral theses written by native-speakers (Charles 2007) and a corpus of research articles extracted from high-impact journals (Flowerdew 2015a). These ESP practitioners can thus be seen to be operating from a centripetal standpoint, arguably perpetuating the linguistic and rhetorical norms of the centre privileged Anglophone discourse community. While critical theorists may somewhat justifiably lament Anglophone dominance at the expense of academic discourses of other languages (see Bennett 2014; Lillis and Curry 2010), this pull towards the centripetal force is often a question of decision-making at the national level. For example, Bardi and Muresan (2014) report that in 2005 the Ministry of Education in Romania issued a statement saying that academic staff should publish in international West European and American journals. Subsequent to this, in order to build a comprehensive picture of academics' perceptions about reporting research according to international journal standards and actual writing practices, Bardi and Muresan carried out a triangulated data analysis combining survey and interview data with corpus data, thus mirroring the kind of specialised 'localised' ESP corpus building advocated by Flowerdew (2004) as the analyst would have familiarity with the socio-cultural context in which the text was created. Their interviews with Romanian researchers who had published in high-quality journals indicated that they were favourably disposed towards expanding their linguistic knowledge to meet the demands of these journals with Bardi and Muresan commenting thus: 'The role of English as a gate to international participation seems to be accepted, and most respondents prefer to build on this reality rather than contest it for ideological reasons' (147). It can be argued that ESP tutors generally operate within the same bounds of reality, preferring to take a down-to-earth pragmatic approach, often aided by corpus methodologies to uncover prototypical patterns, rather than adopting a critical approach to the dominant literacy practices. In the Ac Lits tradition students' resistance to 'dominant literacy practices' tends to be foregrounded; however, the above cases have shown that students' and researchers may also express resistance to taking a more critical literacy stance.

As well as adopting a critical stance to pedagogy in which academic space is contested in the sense of whose voices and knowledge get to be heard, Ac List practitioners also emphasise what is unique**.** This is another significant difference between the two approaches as ESP practitioners tend to emphasise what is prototypical**.** As Swales (2004) has pointed out, what may be most useful for scholarly writing is a focus on what is recurring, especially in various science and engineering genres where conventionalised lexico-grammar is inscribed in the text, as revealed by numerous corpus studies. Very recently, a few corpus tools, underpinned by Swales's move/step construct, have been devised as an aid for postgraduate students and novice researchers. The most sophisticated of

these is the *Research Writing Tutor* (RWT) developed by Cotos (2014) (see also Cotos, Link, and Huffman 2014, 2015) which analyses students' research articles, generates discipline-specific feedback based on the rhetorical conventions of that particular genre, and then provides corpus-derived feedback for writing improvement. Learner corpora of academic writing have also recently been integrated into technology-enhanced writing programmes. Birch-Bécaas and Cooke (2012) discuss an online tool to raise researchers' awareness of writing research article introductions. This tool incorporates a corpus of NNS drafts and revised versions, processed pedagogically to highlight rhetorical and linguistic features posing particular difficulty for French speakers. In another online writing programme a specialised corpus, comprising a learner corpus of Master's theses and a reference corpus of research articles from the field of applied chemistry, has been compiled by Nordrum and Eriksson (2015) to help students master the complex phenomenon of data commentary, i.e. the verbal comment on visual material as they occur in specific move structures. A unique feature of this programme is that it incorporates an activity whereby students retrieve data commentaries from the master's theses together with their specific moves and are given prompts to have them critically assess the genre they are trying to produce themselves.

It must be stressed, however, that a Swalesian genre perspective has some compatability with the Ac Lits orientation, as duly acknowledged by Lillis (2013, 49) 'to helping students understand how a range of authentic scientific texts functions in relation to multiple purposes and audiences'. Witness the account in the literature on a communication course for science and engineering PhD students by a leading Ac Lits scholar (Curry 2012). Although the title, *Transcending 'traditional academic boundaries'*, seems to echo the 'transformative' nature of the Ac Lits model expounded in Lillis and Scott (2007), the course is anchored in the Swalesian tradition of genre. Similar to the study reported in Flowerdew (2016), Curry draws on Connor and Mauranen's (1999) move structure analysis of grant proposals for the basis of the materials. She also makes use of 'text-sets' compiled by science and engineering professors that draw on the same research base to reach different audiences e.g. grants, articles, press releases, public talks. Furthermore, Curry's account does not suggest that students are encouraged to take a critical approach by challenging dominant discourses; rather, the opposite seems to be the case. An accommodationist perspective is implied with the course set up to invite researchers and professors to make guest visits to the class.

Wingate (2012) has lamented the lack of a coherent writing pedagogy among Ac Lits practitioners, and, it must be said, that Ac Lits practitioners have acknowledged that there is a need to flesh out the design frame. A recent co-edited volume by Lillis et al. (2015) with case studies from across different disciplinary boundaries in ten different countries on the application of the philosophies and practices underpinning Ac Lits pedagogy goes some way towards redressing this balance; however, there is little in these case studies on the role of language per se. A more clearly articulated Ac Lits framework for scholarly writing, together with a discussion of areas of overlap and divergence from the ESP genre-based tradition, would therefore be most helpful in future studies in which corpora may have a role to play.

Explicit genre-based instruction: a process approach

Lillis and Curry (2006a) take issue with the notion of competence as it is general perceived within the domain of ELT and EAP curricula and pedagogy:

> We argue that the dominant emphasis in ELT on competence as individual knowledge or expertise may be misguided in a number of ways; it does not reflect the real-life text production practices of scholars; and it underplays the importance of the opportunities and resources afforded by the material conditions under which scholars work. (Lillis and Curry 2006a, 63)

They thus argue for 'a shift in emphasis away from the individual producer, towards the relations between the individual, his/her network and the resources that can be mobilised for text production' (63). This paradigm shift is exemplified in Lillis and Curry's (2006b) longitudinal, text-oriented

ethnographic study of 46 scholars in Hungary, Slovakia, Spain and Portugal, in which case studies of individual text histories in writing psychology research articles are presented. Drawing on social practice theories of academic literacy and knowledge construction, Lillis and Curry make the case that all the mediators, i.e. 'literacy brokers', involved in the trajectory from an author's early drafts through to publication need to be considered in the publishing process. Lillis and Curry (2006b) report that of the 130 text histories in psychology 248 literacy brokers were identified, a not inconsiderable number of individuals involved in the process of drafting the paper in an author's network. Literacy brokers are classified into three main groups: academic professionals, language professionals and non-professionals. Academic professionals are sub-divided into three classes: a general academic (a scholar who is not from the same discipline as the author/authors of the paper, a discipline expert (a scholar who shares the same disciplinary background) and a sub-disciplinary specialist (an academic from the same specialist field as the author/authors). 73% of all brokers were reported to fall into this category. Language professionals, comprising 24% of brokers, include not only translators, copy editors and proofreaders, but also English language specialists, such as EAP teachers. Only three percent of brokers were found to be non-professionals, i.e. brokers offering informal support such as friends or family members. In fact, parallels to the most important of these nomenclatures can be found in the ESP literature. For instance, Swales (1990, 130) comments that a 'specialist informant', i.e. a discipline expert, has a useful supportive role for certain types of analyses and for certain parts of texts. Of interest is his following remark:

> … there is a strong suggestion in the literature that the value of specialist informants increases when they are not only conceived of as sources of information and insight, but also as objects of ethnographic study themselves as they negotiate textual material within their own environment. (130)

Their role as negotiators of textual material thus seems very much akin to that of academic literacy brokers, whose contributions to an author's text have been explored in depth in Lillis and Curry (2006b). A synthesis of roles can also be offered from the ESP literature, that of an academic *and* language professional. By way of example, Feak and Reinhart (2002) comment that a decision was made to offer an ESP programme to help international students deal with the linguistic demands of a master of law programme on the basis that one of the EAP instructors had just completed a law degree. He / she would therefore be able to play a dual role as language advisor / 'specialist informant' with inside knowledge of legal writing conventions and the Socratic method of argumentation.

Lillis and Curry's (2006a) framing of competence in scholarly writing as a networked activity, involving multiple literacy brokers is undeniably of considerable value. However, at the same time, individual competence should not be ignored and the important role that language professionals play. Lillis and Curry have carried out longitudinal studies examining the trajectory of an author's article as a networked activity. Likewise, ESP researchers / practitioners have also taken a longitudinal approach, looking at how a postgraduate student shapes and reshapes a research article for publication, but this time in response to self-initiated reflections and text-based interviews with the ESP teacher, i.e. the language broker. Such types of case studies focussing on the processes of explicit learning of a genre are relatively rare in the ESP literature on genre-based pedagogy. The case studies reported in Cheng (2007, 2008, 2011) are illuminating for the insights they reveal on the processes of genre learning. For instance, Cheng (2011) discusses students' identification of language features as pathways to their understanding of complex dimensions such as authorial intentions and markers of disciplinarity in the research article. What is noteworthy about Cheng's exploration is that he is not so much interested in those prototypical features which have become textually conventionalised for signalling specific moves, e.g. the words 'although' and 'remained poorly understood' to help indicate the gap move, but is interested in how students identify non-prototypical language features, i.e. words, phrases and sentence patterns etc. that do not overtly index rhetorical features such as authorial intentions and intertextuality in the targeted genre. By way of example, one student explicates in writing the linguistic devices authors used to describe the variables in their research project. The student's comments indicate his perception of 'we include' as indexing

intertextuality and the repeated use of 'we included' as signalling authorial intention to emphasise the authors' engagement with a previous study. As Cheng (2011) notes, such non-prototypical features are not covered in EAP materials for describing the research method.

The account by Huang (2014) on a PhD student learning to write for publication, similar to the studies reported in Cheng, also examines a student's learning trajectory through explicit instruction of genre with the aim of helping a student to produce a research article published in an indexed journal as part of a requirement for PhD graduation. For this reason, he extends the definition of process knowledge to include all practices, both production and reception, involved in the publication process such as correspondence with journal editors and, importantly, the corresponding author. In this respect, Huang's case study could be seen as mediating between Cheng's fine-grained analysis involving the ESP teacher as the sole language broker and Lillis and Curry's more broad-brush approach involving a range of literacy brokers. Until very recently learner corpus investigations of disciplinary writing centred on language as product (see Flowerdew 2015b). However, one ongoing learner corpus project reported in Wärnsby et al. (2016) can be seen to be anchored in the 'Text Histories' approach through its consideration of thesis writing as process and a networked activity. To this end several drafts and teacher and peer feedback are planned for inclusion in the longitudinal corpus.

One notable difference between the ESP/genre approach and the Ac Lits approach is the value attached to language. The text histories reported in Lillis and Curry (2016b, 2010) on 'postsubmission brokering' focus on re-positioning of structural elements, e.g. the methodology section, deletions and reformulations to avoid digressions, or a shift in the overall argument, changes, in fact, mostly oriented towards content knowledge. Brokers' suggestions for rhetorical reworking are discussed by Lillis and Curry from an ideological perspective of Western Anglo academic practices. In contrast, the accounts by Cheng are oriented towards the first three parts of Tardy's (2009) framework i.e. formal, process and rhetorical knowledge. Also, Huang brings up the issue of plagiarism, which, somewhat surprisingly, is not addressed in Lillis and Curry's accounts. Given that 24% of all brokering activities in Lillis and Curry's longitudinal study are carried out by language professionals, future text histories could aim to solicit more information from this group, especially English language specialists. At the same time, the Text Histories approach and viewing academic writing as a 'networked activity' could usefully inform future genre studies and the compilation and the analysis of learner corpus data of disciplinary writing.

Conclusion

The Ac Lits and ESP/Genre approach share a fair amount of common ground. Ethnographic enquiries, the mainstay of the Ac Lits approach, are also prominent in the ESP/genre approach to shed light on contextual features of the text. A key site of enquiry in the Ac Lits approach is a broad-based investigation of authors' text histories taking a bird's eye view of writing as a networked activity involving various literacy brokers. Authors' text histories also feature in the process approach to explicit ESP/Genre instruction, albeit from a more narrow perspective. However, my main aim in this article has been to showcase how various aspects of ESP/Genre, especially corpus-based enquiries, can usefully inform the Academic Literacies approach. For instance, the findings from corpus-based studies on the research article genre can reveal authorial voice, power relations, identity construction, as well as cross-cultural and cross-linguistic features, important issues raised in the Ac Lits literature. These insights are brought to light through an examination of recurring lexico-grammatical features, which can be mapped onto various rhetorical and pragmatic features. The same principle applies to corpus-based pedagogy for revealing the academic values inscribed in the text. Corpus linguistic techniques, at present largely absent from Ac Lits methodologies, could be considered to supplement ethnographic approaches. Language features such as lexico-grammatical patterns, word choice etc. are well researched and addressed in ESP, but the Ac Lits literature does not have much to say on the question of linguistic elements. There is one corpus study on citation practices,

underpinned by Ac Lits principles (Hewings, Lillis, and Vladimirou 2010), the findings of which can usefully inform pedagogy. The research uses a 1.5 million-word corpus of published psychology articles to explore the citation practices of scholars working in non-Anglophone contexts. The main aim of the research was to foreground significance of the geolinguistic dimension to citation practices by using corpus methods to identify linguistic realisations of integral and non-integral in-text citations, and, with reference to these, analyse bibliographic references according to the language of publication (English, local national language or other languages). Additional corpus-based studies along these lines would enrich the Ac Lits field.

However, if ESP/Genre Analysis is to truly inform/work with Ac Lits approaches there is a need to ensure that it avoids following a 'technicist' model (Turner 2011, cited in Wingate 2018). Wingate (2018) notes two serious shortcomings with EAP classes, which are usually offered exclusively to L2 students. 'One shortcoming is that a non-existent universal academic English is taught to students from a range of disciplines, with a focus on linguistic features such as grammar, structure and style' (351). Another shortcoming concerns the lack of engagement in students' literacy development on the part of subject lecturers with expertise in the community's discourse practices. At the same time as advocating the value of a genre analysis approach to pedagogy (see Cheng 2018 for a comprehensive overview), Wingate also argues for curriculum-integrated academic literacy instruction based on collaboration between EAP specialists and subject lecturers (see Wingate 2018 for accounts of professional development models aimed at enabling lecturers to embed academic literacy development into their teaching). That there is a danger of teaching 'a non-existent universal academic English' in EAP classes has in part arisen from the dominance of English in this era of globalisation. As far back as the 1990s, Swales (1997) raised the issue of the dominance of English (see also Bennett 2007, who refers to this as a 'predatory discourse'), which led to the creation of a lucrative, commercial industry for itself. To counter this 'triumphalism' and ESP's 'accommodationist' and 'technocratic' stance towards the value of English, Swales advocated support for local-language scholarly publications and using the controversies as consciousness-raising exercises in EAP classes for international graduate students. However, during the last two decades since Swales's (1997) critique, as the marketisation of higher education has continued apace with increasing focus on top-down efficiency and generation of income streams (see Ding and Bruce 2017; Hadley 2015), it remains to be seen how widely Wingate's suggestion for curriculum-integrated literacy instruction can be implemented. Against this geopolitical background, I hope the issues raised in this article have made some contribution, however modest, to the debate opened up by Wingate and Tribble on disciplinary writing in higher education.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

Bardi, M., and L. Muresan. 2014. "Changing Research Writing Practices in Romania: Perceptions and Attitudes." In *The Semiperiphery of Academic Writing*, edited by K. Bennett, 121–47. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barton, D. 1994. *Literacy. An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Benesch, S. 2001. *Critical English for Academic Purposes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bennett, K. 2007. "Epistemicide! The Tale of a Predatory Discourse." *The Translator* 13 (2): 151–69.

Bennett, K. 2014. "Conclusion. Countering the Centripetal Forces in Academic Writing." In *The Semiperiphery of Academic Writing*, edited by K. Bennett, 240–6. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Birch-Bécaas, S., and R. Cooke. 2012. "Raising Collective Awareness of Rhetorical Strategies: Using an Online Writing Tool to Demonstrate Discourse Moves in the ESP Classroom." In *Corpus-informed Research and Learning in ESP*, edited by A. Boulton, S. Carter-Thomas, and E. Rowley-Jolivet, 239–60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Charles, M. 2007. "Reconciling Top-down and Bottom-up Approaches to Graduate Writing: Using a Corpus to Teach Rhetorical Functions." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 6: 289–302.

Cheng, A. 2007. "Transferring Generic Features and Recontextualising Genre Awareness: Understanding Writing Performance in the ESP Genre-based Literacy Framework." *English for Specific Purposes* 26: 287–307.
Cheng, A. 2008. "Analysing Genre Exemplars in Preparation for Writing. The Case of an L2 Graduate Student in the ESP Genre-based Instructional Framework of Academic Literacy." *Applied Linguistics* 29: 50–71.
Cheng, A. 2011. "Language Features as the Pathway to Genre: Students' Attention to Non-prototypical Features and its Implications." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 20: 69–82.
Cheng, A. 2018. *Genre and Graduate Level Research Writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Connor, U. 2011. *Intercultural Rhetoric in the Writing Classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Connor, U. 2013. "Corpus Linguistics in Intercultural Rhetoric." In *Critical and Corpus-based Approaches to Intercultural Rhetoric*, edited by D. Belcher, and G. Nelson, 8–21. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Connor, U., and A. Mauranen. 1999. "Linguistic Analyses of Grant Proposals: European Union Grant Proposals." *English for Specific Purposes* 18: 47–62.
Cotos, E. 2014. *Genre-based Automated Writing Evaluation for L2 Writing Research: From Design to Evaluation and Enhancement*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Cotos, E., S. Huffman, and S. Link. 2015. "Furthering and Applying Move/Step Constructs: Technology-driven Marshalling of Swalesian Genre Theory for EAP Pedagogy." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 19: 52–72.
Cotos, E., S. Link, and S. Huffman. 2014. "Studying Disciplinary Corpora to Teach the Craft of Discussion." *Writing & Pedagogy* 8 (1): 33–64.
Curry, M. J. 2012. "Transcending 'Traditional Academic Boundaries': Designing and Implementing a Science Communication Course for Science and Engineering PhD Students." *Journal of the IATEFL ESP SIG*, 4–7.
Curry, M. J., and T. Lillis. 2013. *A Scholar's Guide to Publishing Journal Articles in English: Critical Choices, Practical Strategies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Dahl, K. 2004. "Textual Metadiscourse in Research Articles: A Marker of National Culture or of Academic Discipline?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1807–25.
Devitt, A. 2009a. "Re-fusing Form in Genre Study." In *Genres in the Internet: Issues in the Theory of Genre*, edited by J. Giltrow, and D. Stein, 27–47. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Devitt, A. 2009b. "Teaching Critical Genre Awareness." In *Genre in a Changing World*, edited by C. Bazerman, A. Bonini, and D. Figueredo, 342–55. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearing House and Parlor Press.
Ding, A., and I. Bruce. 2017. *The English for Academic Purposes Practitioner. Operating on the Edge of Academia*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. 2012. "Grammar and Discourse." In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, edited by C. Chapelle. London: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0464.
Feak, C., and S. Reinhart. 2002. "An ESP Program for Students of Law." In *English for Specific Purposes*, edited by T. Orr, 7–24. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
Fløttum, K., T. Dahl, and T. Kinn. 2006. *Academic Voices. Across Languages and Disciplines*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Flowerdew, L. 2004. "The argument for using English Specialized Corpora to Understand Academic and Professional Language." In *Discourse in the Professions. Perspectives from Corpus Linguistics*, ediited by U. Connor and T. Upton, 11–33. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Flowerdew, L. 2015a. "Using Corpus-based Research and Online Academic Corpora to Inform Writing of the Discussion Section of a Thesis." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 20: 58–68.
Flowerdew, L. 2015b. "Learner Corpora and Language for Academic and Specific Purposes." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Learner Corpus Research*, edited by S. Granger, G. Gilquin, and F. Meunier, 465–484. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Flowerdew, L. 2016. "A Genre-inspired and Lexico-grammatical Approach for Helping Postgraduate Students Craft Research Grant Proposals." *English for Specific Purposes* 42: 1–12.
Giannoni, D. S. 2010. *Mapping Academic Values in the Disciplines*. Bern: Peter Lang.
Hadley, G. 2015. *English for Academic Purposes in Neoliberal Universities. A Critical Grounded Theory*. London: Springer.
Halliday, M. A. K., A. McIntosh, and P. Strevens. 1964. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
Hathaway, J. 2015. "Developing that Voice: Locating Academic Writing Tuition in the Mainstream of Higher Education." *Teaching in Higher Education* 20: 506–517.
Hewings, A., T. Lillis, and D. Vladimirou. 2010. "Who's Citing Whose Writings? A Corpus-based Study of Citations as Interpersonal Resource in English Medium National and English Medium Journals." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 9 (2): 102–15.
Huang, J. 2014. "Learning to Write for Publication in English through Genre-based Pedagogy. A Case in Taiwan." *System* 45: 175–86.
Hyland, K. 2002. "Authority and Invisibility: Authorial Identity in Academic Writing." *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1091–112.
Hyland, K. 2012. *Disciplinary Identities. Individuality and Community in Academic Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ivanič, R. 1998. *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Johns, A. M. 2011. "The Future of Genre in L2 Writing: Fundamental, but Contested, Instructional Decisions." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 20: 56–68.
Koutsantoni, D. 2006. "Rhetorical Strategies in Engineering Research Articles and Research Theses. Advanced Academic Literacy and Relations of Power." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 5: 19–36.
Kubota, R. 2010. "Cross-cultural Perspectives on Writing: Contrastive Rhetoric." In *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*, edited by N. H. Hornberger, and S. L. McKay, 265–89. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Kubota, R., and A. Lehner. 2004. "Toward Critical Contrastive Rhetoric." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13: 7–27.
Lea, M. R. 2004. "Academic Literacies: A Pedagogy for Course Design." *Studies in Higher Education* 29: 739–56.
Lea, M. R., and B. V. Street. 1998. "Student Writing in Higher Education: An Academic Literacies Approach." *Studies in Higher Education* 23: 157–72.
Lillis, T. 2001. *Student Writing. Access, Regulation, Desire*. London: Routledge.
Lillis, T. 2006. *Moving Towards an 'Academic Literacies' Pedagogy: Dialogues of Participation. Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education: Theories, Practices and Models*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Lillis, T. 2008. "Ethnography as Method, Methodology, and 'Deep Theorizing'. Closing the Gap between Text and Context in Academic Writing Research." *Written Communication* 25 (3): 353–88.
Lillis, T. 2013. *The Sociolinguistics of Writing*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Lillis, T. M., and M. J. Curry. 2006a. "Reframing Notions of Competence in Scholarly Writing: From Individual to Networked Activity." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 53: 63–78.
Lillis, T. M., and M. J. Curry. 2006b. "Professional Academic Writing by Multilingual Scholars: Interactions with Literacy Brokers in the Production of English Medium Text." *Written Communication* 23: 3–35.
Lillis, T., and M. J. Curry. 2010. *Academic Writing in a Global Context. The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*. London: Routledge.
Lillis, T., K. Harrington, M. Lea, and S. Mitchell, eds. 2015. *Working with Academic Literacies: Case Studies Towards Transformative Practice*. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse/Parlor Press.
Lillis, T., and M. Scott. 2007. "Defining Academic Literacies Research: Issues of Epistemology, Ideology and Strategy." *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4: 5–32.
Lillis, T., and J. Tuck. 2016. "Academic Literacies. A Critical Lens on Writing and Reading in the Academy." In *the Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*, edited by K. Hyland, and P. Shaw, 30–43. London: Routledge.
Mur Dueñas, P. 2009. "Logical Markers in L1 (Spanish and English) and L2 English Business Research Articles." *English Text Construction* 2: 246–64.
Nordrum, L., and A. Eriksson. 2015. "Data Commentary in Science Writing: Using a Small, Specialized Corpus for Formative Self-assessment Practices." In *Learner Corpora in Language Testing and Assessment*, edited by M. Callies, and S. Götz, 59–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Paltridge, B., S. Starfield, and C. M. Tardy. 2016. *Ethnographic Perspectives on Academic Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Parkinson, J. 2013. "Adopting Academic Values: Student use of That-complement Clauses in Academic Writing." *System* 41: 428–42.
Parkinson, J. 2016. "Teaching Writing for Science and Technology." In *Discipline-specific Writing: Theory Into Practice*, edited by J. Flowerdew, and T. Costley, 95–112. London: Routledge.
Partington, A., A. Duguid, and C. Taylor. 2013. *Patterns and Meanings in Discourse. Theory and Practice in Corpus-assisted Discourse Studies (CADS)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Pérez-Llantada, C. 2014a. "Formulaic Language in L1 and L2 Expert Academic Writing: Convergent and Divergent Usage." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 14: 84–94.
Pérez-Llantada, C. 2014b. "Researching Genres with Multilingual Corpora: A Conceptual Enquiry." In *Corpus Analysis for Descriptive and Pedagogic Purposes. ESP Perspectives*, edited by M. Gotti, and D. Giannoni, 107–20. Bern: Peter Lang.
Street, B. 1984. *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stubbs, M. 2001. "On Inference Theories and Code Theories: Corpus Evidence for Semantic Schemas." *Text* 21: 437–65.
Swales, J. M. 1981. *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Birmingham: The University of Aston.
Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Swales, J. M. 1997. "English as Tyrannosaurus Rex." *World Englishes* 16 (3): 373–82.
Swales, J. M. 2004. *Research Genres*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Swales, J. M. 2009. "Plenary Presentation, British Association of Lecturers in English for Academic Purposes Conference: English for Specific Academic Purposes." April 5–7, in Reading, UK.
Tardy, C. M. 2009. *Building Genre Knowledge*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
Tribble, C., and U. Wingate. 2013. "From Text to Corpus: A Genre-based Approach to Academic Literacy Instruction." *System* 41: 307–21.
Turner, J. 2011. *Language in the Academy: Cultural Reflexivity and Intercultural Dynamics*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Warnsby, A., A. Kauppinen, A. Eriksson, M. Wiktorsson, E. Bick, and J-L. Olsson. 2016. "Building Interdisciplinary Bridges: MUCH: The Malmö University-chalmers Corpus of Academic Writing as a Process." In *New Approaches to English Linguistics*, edited by O. Timofeeva et al., 197–212. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wharton, S. 2012. "Epistemological and Interpersonal Stance in a Data Description Task: Findings from a Discipline-specific Learner Corpus." *English for Specific Purposes* 31: 261–70.
Wingate, U. 2012. "Using Academic Literacies and Genre-based Models for Academic Writing Instruction: A 'Literacy' Journal." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 11: 26–37.
Wingate, U. 2015. *Academic Literacy and Student Diversity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Wingate, U. 2018. "Academic Literacy across the Curriculum: Towards a Collaborative Instructional Approach." *Language Teaching* 51: 349–64.
Wingate, U., and C. Tribble. 2012. "The Best of Both Worlds? Towards an English for Academic Purposes/Academic Literacies Writing Pedagogy." *Studies in Higher Education* 37: 481–95.