Journal of English for Academic Purposes 43 (2020) 100813

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of English for Academic Purposes

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jeap

Graduate-level research writing instruction: Two Chinese EAP teachers' localized ESP genre-based pedagogy

Yongyan Li [a], Xiaohao Ma [b], Jing Zhao [c], Jiehui Hu [d, *]

[a] Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China
[b] School of Foreign Language Education, Jilin University, No. 2699, Qianjin Street, Changchun, Jilin, 130012, China
[c] College of Foreign Languages and Literature, Fudan University, 220 Han Dan Road, Shanghai, 200433, China
[d] School of Foreign Languages, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, No. 2006, Xiyuan Road, Chengdu, Sichuan, 611731, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 7 April 2019
Received in revised form 27 October 2019
Accepted 3 November 2019
Available online 5 November 2019

Keywords:
Graduate-level research writing instruction
Novice EAP instructors
EAP teachers' professional development
ESP genre pedagogy
Language teaching in genre pedagogy

ABSTRACT

Genre-oriented graduate-level research writing instruction is increasingly being implemented in universities around the world, to cater for the widely-felt demand to provide graduate writing support to student populations of immensely diverse compositions. In China, where research writing instruction for graduate students across disciplines is urgently needed, emerging EAP teachers are learning the ropes of genre-based pedagogies through practice. This paper reports a case study of how two novice EAP teachers, who had attended a professional development program, went about conducting research writing instruction to doctoral students at their own universities in China. Our dataset consisted of audio-recordings of the focal teachers' classroom instruction, various types of documentary data, and interview data. We present the findings with a comparison between the two cases of pedagogical practices, by highlighting the distinguishing features of the focal teachers' classroom instruction, and illuminating their instruction on language. Our study contributes to the limited literature on EAP research writing instruction and will inform EAP teachers' training and professional development.

1. Introduction

Graduate-level research writing instruction adopting genre-based pedagogies, in particular in the ESP tradition of genre theory (Cargill & O'Connor, 2013; Cheng, 2018; Swales & Feak, 2012), has grown in prominence in recent decades. Courses offered in this spirit are not limited to North America (e.g., Cheng, 2018) and other English-speaking countries (e.g., Starfield, 2016); they are also found elsewhere in the world, such as Europe (e.g., Kuteeva, 2013) and Asia (e.g., Flowerdew & Wang, 2017; Li, Flowerdew, & Cargill, 2018), as educators respond to the widely-felt demand for providing graduate writing support to student populations of immensely diverse compositions (Simpson, Caplan, Cox, & Phillips, 2016). In EFL contexts, where English has traditionally been taught as a generic skills course focusing on grammar, vocabulary and reading skills, needs for graduate-level research writing instruction have been growing fast. This is particularly true of the Chinese mainland, where research writing instruction for graduate students across disciplines is urgently needed but suffers from a lack of systematic teacher preparation or training for the purpose (Li & Ma, 2018). Those who have sought in-service professional

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: yongyan@hku.hk (Y. Li), xiaohao@jlu.edu.cn (X. Ma), jing_zhao@fudan.edu.cn (J. Zhao), hujiehui@uestc.edu.cn (J. Hu).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100813
1475-1585/

development (PD) in EAP are more likely to play an active part in shifting the traditional English curriculum of their institutions. However, these practitioners are "novice instructors" (Cheng, 2018) still in the process of learning the ropes of genre-based pedagogies, despite their previous (sometimes prolonged) experience in general ELT. It is important to examine how these novice instructors teach EAP so as to gauge how the field can be better prepared to meet the rising demand. To this end, this paper reports a case study of two novice EAP teachers providing research writing instruction to doctoral students at their own universities in China. Studying existing classroom practices in the Chinese context would illustrate what research writing instruction may be like in an environment characterized by the burgeoning of EAP in the traditional soil of general ELT, a scenario with some universality on a global scale.

2. Literature review

EAP teachers almost always need to deal with mixed-disciplines classes (Starfield, 2016). An implication of this challenge is that the EAP teacher should engage their class in tasks that are relevant and meaningful for all students, irrespective of their disciplinary background. In line with this requirement, practitioner-researchers in the ESP tradition of genre pedagogy have placed premium on the so-called "inductive and discovery-based genre analysis" (Cheng, 2018), designed to raise students' rhetorical consciousness. During inductive and discovery-based genre analysis, students are guided by the instructor to examine a sample of the target genre in a multilayered manner, asking questions along the dimensions of the rhetorical context, the organizational pattern, and lexical-grammatical features, and comparing the sample under question with other instances of the research article genre in one's own discipline (Cheng, 2018, p. 91). For each dimension, "teaching points" may be developed by the instructor in view of the nature of the target text, students' needs, and relevant research findings (Cheng, 2018).

Individual teachers, however, depending on their training background and knowledge of ESP genre pedagogy, the teaching time available, students' English proficiency level, and accessible resources, can be expected to be teaching in a variety of ways. With novice EAP instructors, it has been found that PD has a positive impact on their classroom instruction. Based on interviews with six teachers teaching undergraduate first-year writing courses, Tardy (2017) reported that the teachers' learning/reading about genre pedagogies (in different traditions) was reflected in their teaching, with them being able to strategically deploy their knowledge during instruction, including using guiding questions to engage students in analyzing multiple examples of a genre. In addition, Campion's (2016, p. 67) interview study with a group of English teachers in the UK transitioning from general ELT to EAP revealed that the benefits of PD and of "practical experiences" are "symbiotic" for these teachers. In a classroom setting, this would mean that their uptake from PD will work with many other factors to shape their classroom instruction.

In an EAP writing class for ESL/EFL students, there is a question of how to embed language teaching into genre-based instruction. There seem to be two levels of concern here. On one level, language teaching takes place by being embodied in genre-based instruction; the focus is on understanding language choices in relation to the rhetorical purposes they construct in view of specific content (Hyland, 2007). Thus instructional time may be devoted to analyzing lexico-grammatical features associated with specific rhetorical moves and sections of a research article, such as sentence templates, tense and voice, citation forms, and choice of verbs/modal verbs for expressing varied strength of claims (e.g., Cargill & O'Connor, 2013; Cheng, 2018; Swales & Feak, 2012). Much attention has been given to facilitating students' language learning on this first level, nowadays typically with the aid of corpus methods (e.g., Flowerdew & Wang, 2017). Yet on another level, beyond a genre-specific approach to language instruction, ESL/EFL novice writers often "[need] help with putting sentences together as well" (Starfield, 2016, p. 191). It seems the literature contains much less evidence of addressing ESL/EFL students' language learning needs at this micro-level.

EAP teachers' readiness to teach language cannot be taken for granted. Tardy (2017) was surprised that all six teachers in her study mentioned they felt under-equipped to address the issue of language in their writing class which was designed to be more concerned with macro-level issues. One teacher "described feeling that a focus on language was exactly what his students needed but that he lacked a wide pool of strategies for teaching this" (Tardy, 2017, p. 76). In the Chinese context, we have also reported a group of teachers in a PD program expressing concerns over how to embed language teaching in genre-based instruction, commenting that their students' inadequate English proficiency would pose a challenge to implementing the ESP genre pedagogy demonstrated by the expert EAP specialist they observed (Li & Cargill, 2019, p. 156). Beyond such concerns, how language teaching may actually be taking place as part of the emerging genre-based research writing instruction in China is little known; but findings from classrooms are likely to provide wider implications.

The study to be reported in this paper will show how two novice EAP instructors in two Chinese classrooms went about teaching English for research publication purposes to graduate students, and how they both in their own ways addressed the issue of language in the context of learning to do research writing.

3. The Chinese context

In the Chinese tertiary sector there have been extensive calls for an EAP-turn of the traditional English for General Purposes courses at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Since the early 2000s, the paradigm shift has been slowly unfolding at an increasing number of universities (Li & Ma, 2018). At the same time, given that university English teachers in China have typically earned their degrees in linguistics, second language acquisition, and literature, and have been engaging in general

ELT, the demand for them to become competent EAP teachers means that additional training is needed, a challenge likewise faced by their international counterparts (e.g., Campion, 2016). As EAP continues to be largely absent in the degree programs for English teachers in the country, those who are making the transition have primarily relied on their own initiatives, often collectively with their colleagues, to develop EAP pedagogical knowledge and sometimes a research interest in EAP. Prominent channels for the emerging Chinese EAP teachers' PD include national conferences (such as the annual China EAP Association Conference, inaugurated in 2015) and various training programs (such as an annual EAP PD program hosted by the China EAP Association since January 2017).

For these new EAP teachers, particularly those teaching graduate-level research writing courses, a central area of expertise that they aim to develop in is genre pedagogies, a notion first introduced into China in the late 1990s to early 2000s (e.g., Han & Qin, 2000). Chinese academic literature reveals that genre pedagogies, specifically the ESP genre pedagogy, sometimes in combination with the Australian genre approach, have been applied in teaching academic writing courses (see Li & Ma, 2018 for a review). Yet the existing Chinese literature that reports on genre-based instruction tends to lack instructional details (Li & Ma, 2018). How genre approaches are being implemented by the emerging Chinese EAP teachers in their research writing courses remains largely unknown. Developing insights into novice EAP instructors' classroom practices in the Chinese context will be a welcome contribution to the field, when classroom reports are in short supply in the EAP literature in general (Tardy, 2017).

4. Methods

4.1. Research setting, research question, and the two focal teachers

Our study was part of a larger research project on the teaching of English academic writing to graduate students in China. Apart from conducting interviews and surveys (results of which will be reported elsewhere), we decided a case study of individual teachers' classroom instruction would be needed to address our research interest. As a research strategy, case study allows researchers to investigate a phenomenon within a single bounded system (e.g., a case of teaching graduate-level research writing) or multiple bounded systems (several of such cases) over time, "through detailed, in-depth data collection" (Creswell, 2007, p. 73). The present study has chosen to focus on two cases of teaching, i.e., the classroom instruction of two focal teachers. Including two cases in a study would potentially offer opportunities of comparison, thus deepening the theoretical potential of the analysis and enhancing the transferability of the findings to other settings (Creswell, 2007).

We aimed to answer this overarching research question: *How did the two focal teachers go about conducting instruction in a genre-oriented graduate-level research writing course*? Two teachers, Jing and Jiehui, working at two different Chinese universities, were the focal participants as well as co-researchers in this study, and thus are among the co-authors of the present paper. Their universities, located in two Chinese cities (one coastal and the other in-land), are both considered tier-one; both institutions have a publication requirement for doctoral students. In line with this requirement, at both universities there has been an institutional push toward reforming the traditional general English courses and introducing EAP at all levels.

The first author (Yongyan) met Jing and Jiehui at the China EAP Association's first EAP PD program in January 2017. During the program, a group of teachers from universities across the country, including Jing and Jiehui, observed how an overseas EAP expert (Margaret Cargill) taught an 18 h course on "Writing and publishing scientific research articles in international journals" to a class of science research students (see Li & Cargill, 2019, for a study of the teacher attendants' learning and reflection at the PD site). At the time Jing had taught a writing for publication course for one round to a class of medical doctoral students; while Jiehui would be teaching such a course to doctoral students soon for the first time. Other than this PD experience and occasional attendance of seminars on EAP, neither had received any formal training in EAP. Both focal teachers hold a PhD degree, in psycholinguistics (Jing) and neurolinguistics (Jiehui) respectively, and thus they are in the small minority of the Chinese university English teachers who have earned a doctorate (Wang & Wang, 2011). At the time of the study, Jing had been an EAP teacher for 2.5 years and had published articles in psycholinguistics in several indexed Chinese journals, while Jiehui had been a general English instructor for about 15 years (apart from teaching research methods and academic reading courses) and had published both in neurolinguistics (mainly in SCI English journals) and curriculum studies (in indexed Chinese journals).

4.2. The two focal courses, data collection, and data analysis

Two research writing courses, taught by Jing and Jiehui respectively to Year 1 doctoral classes at their home institutions soon after their attendance of the PD program described above, became our focal courses in the study. For Jing the course was her 3rd run and for Jiehui the course was his 2nd run. Table 1 shows some basic information of the two focal courses.

Data collection in the settings of the two focal courses was conducted while the courses were being taught. Table 2 summarizes our dataset.

The data collection at the two research sites, including the pre-course and post-course interviews, were conducted by two research assistants who were Master's students in the English departments of Jing and Jiehui. All the relevant course sessions were audio-recorded; a template, which was a log sheet with three columns (Time, Teacher Actions, and Student Response/Actions), was provided to the research assistants for writing observational fieldnotes during classroom observation. As shown in Table 2, Jing also wrote teaching journal entries, again using a provided template, in which she responded to questions such

Table 1
A profile of the two focal courses.

	Jing	Jiehui
Timing	Semester 1, 2017-18	Semester 2, 2017-18
Discipline of the target doctoral students	Medicine	Electronic science and technology
Class size	25 Year 1 doctoral students	30 Year 1 doctoral students
Medium of instruction	Both the slides and the teacher talk were in English; the teacher-student interactions during the group consultations were in Chinese	English slides but a mixture of Chinese and English in the teacher talk
Coursebook recommended to the students but not used in class	Sun et al. (2012)	Glasman-Deal (2010)
Key components (relevant to this study) counting to students' final grade	Class presentation, short research paper writing, assignments, and a final error correction task	Participation in class (e.g. sharing on QQ www.qq.com), assignments, and a phrasebank

Table 2
A summary of the collected data.

Sources of data	Jing	Jiehui
The focal teaching sessions	• Audio-recordings of the class sessions (12 h) • Observational fieldnotes	• Audio-recordings of the class sessions (a little below 16 h) • Observational fieldnotes
Course materials	• PowerPoint slides • Course outline • Requirements of assignment tasks • 5 student groups' short research papers (each on a self-selected topic)	• PowerPoint slides • Requirements of assignment tasks • Screenshots of shared examples and student work on QQ
Teaching journal entries	7	0
Interviews with the focal teachers	• Pre-course and post-course interviews (total 52 min) • Interview during the data analysis stage (35 min)	• Pre-course and post-course interviews (total 26 min) • Interview during the data analysis stage (25 min)
Post-course focus group interviews with students	• Two focus group interviews with 9 students (total 50 min)	• One focus group interview with 8 students (16 min)

as "What were your goals for the session and to what extent were the goals achieved?", and "What strategies of teaching, either planned or unplanned, did you employ? How effective were they?".

The interviews in the data collection stage were all semi-structured, conducted in Chinese and audio-recorded. The pre-course interview with the teachers asked questions such as "Can you talk about and explain the design of this course?" and "What challenges do you anticipate?"; the post-course interview covered questions such as "Which parts of the course, or which materials/activities, worked particularly well? Which worked less well?". The interviews with the two teachers during the data analysis stage, conducted over WeChat (a popular messaging and calling app in China) and by email, served several purposes: member checks, clarifying/elaborating certain points, and stimulating reflection. The post-course focus group interviews with students asked questions such as "What do you like most about this course?" and "What suggestions do you have for making the course even more useful?" The audio-recorded course sessions and interviews were transcribed and checked against the recordings.

The focus of our analysis, in line with our research purpose, was not on the effectiveness of the focal teaching, but on making sense of the focal pedagogical practices. Overall, we combined categorizing and connecting strategies (Maxwell, 2005) to code the data and create narratives from the data. Firstly, the transcripts of all the teaching sessions were coded (categorized) in QSR International's *NVivo11* using a grounded and inductive approach, in line with our previous methods of analyzing EAP classroom discourse (Li, Cargill, Gao, Wang, & O'Connor, 2019; Li et al., 2018). As both focal teachers covered the main sections of an AIMRaD paper (with Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion), parts of the classroom discourse data were coded with the section headings as the higher-level codes, which subsumed lower-level *in vivo* codes based on the two teachers' own words, to describe their practices. As it soon became clear that both teachers placed some emphasis on the issue of language and language learning, this dimension was separated out. Here *in vivo* codes served as higher-level codes, subsuming lower-level codes which gathered evidence for the categories of meaning. We consistently kept the codes on the two teachers' teaching distinct from each other, to maintain the logic and connection of the within-case stories, while at the same time constantly making cross-case comparisons to look for similarities and differences between the two cases. As another connecting strategy of analysis, particularly illustrative pieces of data (e.g., individual slides and the focal teachers' classroom discourse) were selected and annotated in terms of the rhetorical actions performed. Our analytical process led us to decide that characterizing the distinguishing features of the two teachers' instruction, as well as delineating their ways of attending to their students' language learning needs, would effectively bring out the themes that best address our research question.

Table 3
The research writing sessions of the focal courses.

Jing's sessions (Oct–Dec 2017)		Jiehui's sessions (Mar–May 2018)	
Session	Sub-genre focus	Session	Sub-genre focus
1	Title; Introduction	1	Title
2	Materials & Methods (M&M)	2	Abstract
3	Introduction + M&M review	3	Abstract
4	Results	4	Introduction
5	Comments on Introduction + M&M	5	Introduction
6	Discussion	6	Introduction
7	Results + Discussion review	7	Methods
8	Abstract; Cover letter & response to the reviewers	8	Results
9	Comments on Results + Discussion	9	Discussion
10	Comments on Abstract	10	Referees' review criteria & response to the reviewers

5. Findings

5.1. An introductory sketch

Both Jing and Jiehui felt an important observation they gained from the PD program they attended in January 2017 was the value of using journal articles from the students' own disciplines as teaching materials. The insight helped them meet the challenge of teaching heterogeneous classes: although Jing's students shared an overarching discipline of medicine and Jiehui's were in the broad discipline of electronic science and technology, their students represented a wide range of sub-disciplines. Early in the course, Jiehui asked the students to pick "five excellent, typical papers" each in their field for use in class, when he would prompt the students from time to time to check their "own discipline articles" (or "ODAs") (a term that he picked up from the PD program) to study a section. Jing's students were required to submit 10 papers each from their disciplines at the beginning of the course. These papers, diverse in format, provided a source of examples for her to select from to use on her slides to illustrate the rhetorical components of the research article sections.[1]

Both teachers also enjoyed much freedom in choosing their materials and strategies in teaching, without any official syllabus to cover. Other than the PD experience which informed their teaching and strengthened their confidence in the teaching, the two teachers used various reference materials in preparing their courses, including the coursebooks recommended to students but not used during teaching (indicated in Table 1). Jing further benefited from joint teaching preparation and sharing of materials with her colleagues who taught other cohorts of students. Table 3 maps out the two teachers' sessions that focused on writing for publication (mostly 1.5 h-long in each session for both) which provided the main source of classroom data we gathered in the study.[2]

It can be seen from Table 3 that both teachers covered the main sections of an AIMRaD article. Jing also had two "review" sessions (Sessions 3 and 7) which were devoted to peer review of short research papers written by student groups, and three "comments" sessions (Sessions 5, 9, and 10) which focused on further discussion of the short papers, after she had given written feedback.

5.2. Distinguishing features of the focal teachers' classroom instruction

5.2.1. Jing's instruction

5.2.1.1. Slide-based instruction on moves and language features. Jing's slide-based instruction focused on illustrating the individual moves of research article sections and related language features. For example, in Session 1 on the Introduction section, she showed a slide on "Pattern or sequence of moves": Move 1. Presenting background information; Move 2. Reviewing related research; and Move 3. Stating the current research. This framework, according to Jing, was informed by the analysis of Sun, Tang, and Wang (2012) and Budgell (2009), both focusing on medical research writing. Then several slides were presented on Move 1. Table 4 reproduces the main content of these slides, together with our annotation.

[1] Jing also included elements of corpus methods into her instruction, which was an inspiration from the PD program she attended. In her introductory session, she talked about how to build a corpus of journal articles and introduced online corpora such as Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA); in later sessions, she also demonstrated searching in a corpus of journal articles (e.g., checking the use of particular verbs, when teaching the Discussion section; and checking usages, when talking about errors in student writings). In contrast, Jiehui only showed his class how to build a corpus of ODAs but corpus use was not a feature of his instruction. In the post-course interview he mentioned that he would give more weight to corpus use in future instruction.

[2] This excludes an introductory session and later sessions on "international conference communication" (in the case of Jing) and a session on "summary and review" (in the case of Jiehui).

Table 4
Jing's slide presentation on "Move 1 Presenting background information" in Introduction.

Move 1 Presenting background information	Our annotation
• Introduce terminology which is specific to our study area ▪ Abbreviations and acronyms should be defined within brackets following the full term to which they apply. ○ Complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) ▪ Once they have been introduced, they should be used throughout the paper in preference to the full term.	- Rules for introducing field-specific terminology, with an example
• Present verb tense ○ Angiogenesis is the process of information of new capillaries from existing ones. It plays a pivotal role in growth and development as well as in tumor growth and various ischemic and inflammatory diseases.	- Highlighting a language feature, with an example
• Frequent use of locative and temporal adverbials that help to contextualize the paper for the reader ○ Between 1990 and 2000, the rate of HIV infection in Botswana … ○ The number of women in medicine has grown rapidly since 1970.	- Highlighting another language feature, with examples

Table 4 shows that Jing presented some rhetorical rules of writing "Move 1 Presenting background information", highlighting language features with examples where necessary.

Jing, however, felt that her teaching, despite having been preceded by students' presentations on the target section (see below), was more deductive than inductive. She would have preferred a more inductive approach if time allowed:

> If there is more time, I'd like to give students one biomedical research paper and ask them to find patterns of moves and tense/voice use in groups by themselves, therefore using a more inductive way of teaching. (Teaching journal following Session 1)

Compared with Jiehui who frequently conducted multilayered text analysis (to be detailed later), genre analysis of multiple text extracts did not seem to be a feature of Jing's instruction.

5.2.1.2. Students presenting on a section before it was taught, writing a short research paper, giving and receiving feedback, and completing genre analysis assignments. Before Jing taught a particular section, she always asked three students to research the target section before class and give presentations in class: the first student focusing on the structure of the section, the second on the language features, and the third giving examples to illustrate the structure and language features.[3] Jing explained in her teaching journal: "I assigned presentation tasks to students in advance to see how well they could figure out about this part before I taught them."

In addition, to Jing, apart from the talk on moves and lexico-grammatical features, making the students write and helping them improve through peer and teacher feedback is important. She reflected:

> Knowing is different from doing. […] In my opinion, practicing writing and revising manuscripts is much more effective than listening to the teacher talking about how to write, so I always focus more on students' assignments and performance in writing tasks. (Teaching journal following Session 1)

Her students were required to finish a short research paper (of flexible length) in groups of 4–5 over the weeks. They formed groups based on their specialty proximity and chose a topic of their interest, collected data by questionnaire survey, and then wrote up a short paper based on the study.[4] In a group, on average each student was responsible for writing one section of their group paper. Such collaboration resembled "how medical paper are done in collaboration", and also distributed workload, Jing noted. Sessions 3 and 7 were devoted to peer review of the students' 1st draft (Introduction + M&M; and then Results + Discussion) (see Table 3), where two groups exchanged their writing and gave peer feedback (on both language and content). Based on peer feedback, each group then produced their 2nd draft and submitted it to Jing. With her feedback (also on both language and content), the groups were then given a chance to study their teacher-commented draft in the "comments" Sessions (5, 9 and 10), when Jing first reported to the class on some common problems in

[3] This presentation idea was initiated by a colleague of Jing's. The distinction between the three presentations was not clear-cut. For example, the student responsible for introducing structure would include some language features and the one focusing on language would always mention structure.

[4] The groups' topics were: Chinese students' attitudes toward premarital sex (Group 1), societal factors affecting doctor-patient relationship in China (Group 2), medical students' motivations for pursuing a doctorate (Group 3), sleep problems and impacts on health (Group 4), and medical students' occupation selection (Group 5). Jing started to use such a task that required students' data collection through questionnaire before attending the PD program in January 2017. She was pleased to see that the EAP specialist at the PD program (Margaret Cargill) adopted a similar approach with early-candidature graduate students, though with data (also gathered through questionnaire) provided to the students (see Cargill, Gao, Wang, & O'Connor, 2018 for details of the method).

their writings, and then circulated through the groups for group consultations. The groups could choose to revise further and submit to Jing again. A comment in a post-course interview with a group of students indicates that they liked the writing task which was based on a real study they had to conduct and it was different from the writing assignments in their previous study:

> The writing tasks in our previous study did not require us to create a design, collect data and then report. […] But this one was concrete. We were not at a loss, as we had a clear goal. We needed to conduct an investigation on a topic, and then analyze and explain the results. (Post-course interview with the 1st focus group)

To illuminate the process of Jing's group consultations in class after she commented on the students' 2nd drafts, we present Excerpt 1 below (from Session 9), where Jing was interacting with Group 3 (in Chinese), focusing on the Discussion section of their short paper, which was on the topic of medical students' motivations for pursuing a doctorate.

Excerpt 1

S1:	I felt I have nothing much to discuss.
Jing:	Nothing much to discuss. That means your questionnaire design is problematic. […] If the experiment is poorly designed, the paper would be hard to write, because you lack data with value.
S2:	The first paragraph [of the Discussion] is not clear.
Jing:	Should you make it clear? You focused on motivation. Go back and check the research objective or research question stated in Introduction. You need to mention that again here. […]
S3:	Here in the first paragraph there usually should be a general summary of the results. But I felt I kept repeating the limited results. Redundant.
Jing:	Discussion is needed. As I suggested just now, you should refer to the same things in the sections—for instance, if you want to discuss which are internal and which external, you have to say in Methods which items in the questionnaire are related to internal and which related to external. In your Results you also need to report relevant information. Only then will you be able to talk about this in Discussion. Coherence will be achieved then.

Excerpt 1 reveals, in particular, Jing pointing to the Group 3 students' problematic questionnaire design leading to unsatisfactory data, and the lack of alignment between the different sections of their paper. Such instruction seemed to go beyond the traditional role of a language teacher and would require some research and publishing experience on the part of Jing (a point that we will return to in the Conclusion section of this paper).

In addition to assigning the tasks of presentation preparation and short research paper writing, Jing gave a series of four individual genre analysis assignments after class, following the teaching of each of the four sections, namely, Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion. The assignment following Session 1 on Introduction, for instance, required the students to "copy the Introduction section of a recent journal article, highlight stock phrases, and define moves".

5.2.2. *Jiehui's instruction*

5.2.2.1. Multilayered text analysis. Compared with Jing, Jiehui's PowerPoint slides were less detailed. Nevertheless, with slides he used extracts from articles relevant to the students' disciplines from time to time to conduct what he called "case analysis" of texts to demonstrate to the class how to read and learn from the writing of an article, as illustrated below by his teaching of Introduction.

Early in teaching the Introduction section (Session 4), Jiehui showed four key elements of the section on a slide: 1) Introduce the field: What is your question? Why are you asking this question? 2) Describe main problem and what is needed to solve this problem. 3) Explain how you came up with the experiment and why. 4) Announce your hypotheses and predictions. The four elements echo, although do not overlap, with the three moves presented by Jing to her class (see beginning of section 5.2.1.1). He then conducted a "case analysis" of an Introduction extract he selected (which was short and from a *Science* article on a topic of general appeal), going through the extract sentence by sentence, explaining both structure and language. His after-class assignment for the students went: "Choose an article in your discipline. Identify the moves in its Introduction and label them, and for each move, indicate sentence no.(s), analyze the tense use, and record phrases and patterns."[5] This again bears similarity to Jing's assignment task on Introduction, including drawing attention to "phrases and patterns" (resembling Jing's "stock phrases") (see end of section 5.2.1.2).

Following Jiehui's "case analysis" of a text, the students were expected to conduct an "ODA analysis" in teams. Thus in Sessions 5 and 6 which were still on Introduction, Jiehui invited one student representative from each group to share their analysis; in the process, he also selected a text used by a group of students to talk through, in the same manner as he did with a *Science* article in Session 4. His commentary on one such text (in Session 6) is shown in Table 5, with our annotation of the range of rhetorical actions he performed (with those addressing the students' language learning needs underlined).

It can be seen from Table 5 that Jiehui's text analysis was multilayered, in that his teaching points covered both rhetorical aspects of the chosen extract, and various language learning points. In fact, most of the rhetorical actions indicate a

[5] This was one of the two genre analysis assignments that Jiehui gave in the course, the other being analyzing the Abstract of an ODA "to identify the rhetorical moves, tenses, and phrases and patterns".

Table 5
Jiehui's multilayered analysis of an Introduction extract.

On an Introduction extract	Our annotation
Look at the first case example. You can see that the first sentence aligns well with the first part of Introduction, i.e., *describe the field*. "Increased environmental awareness" [giving Chinese translation]; "on the effects of global warming has spurred the emergence for sustainable technologies" [giving Chinese translation of "spurred the emergence for sustainable technologies"]. […]	- Pointing out a rhetorical move - Giving Chinese translation
"This has prompted researchers"—look at the pronoun "This", which connects the sentences; "to explore alternative"—"alternative" is a noun, though it looks like an adjective. Mark out "alternative"—it's a commonly used word when you need to talk about a new technology. […]	- Noting a cohesion link - Defining the parts of speech of a word - Asking students to mark out a word and learn to use it
"IPT, a method of wirelessly transferring power using magnetic resonance coupling, has been emerging blah blah blah"—start to *talk about the background*. This is to explain what IPT is, using a phrase sandwiched by two commas to supply complex information. You should learn to use this syntactic structure. [giving Chinese translation of part of the sentence in the text] And let's see what types of citation is used? Information prominent, because the focus here is to describe the background, rather than disagreements between research teams. So it's a good choice. Very concise. A string of numbers as the citation form, characteristic of IEEE journals.	- Pointing out a rhetorical move - Highlighting a syntactic structure and reminding students to learn to use it - Giving Chinese translation - Noting a form of citation & pointing out it is effective for the rhetorical purpose - Noting the citation style of the journal concerned

consideration of the students' status as English language learners on his part. Jiehui's highlighting of language learning points as teaching points in his multilayered text analysis was a way of his addressing the issue of language during instruction which will be further elaborated later in the paper.

Jiehui's multilayered, somewhat teacher-centered text analysis approach was similarly applied when he talked through other text extracts in class. A total of 24 text extracts were gone through in this manner in the course, with 5 contributed by Jiehui himself and 19 selected from the student groups' sharing (on QQ, of samples from their ODAs in class; see below).

Yet Jiehui saw room for improvement in his predominantly teacher-fronted pedagogy. In the post-course interview, he pointed out that in the future he would want to engage students more to compare across ODAs, with the student groups taking more responsibility, before he conducts summative analysis with the class; to achieve this, there should be more emphasis on students analyzing ODAs before coming to class so that the teacher-fronted lecturing time can be reduced accordingly, he reflected. Jiehui's comment resembles Jing's, who pointed out that she would prefer a more inductive approach if time allowed, as reported earlier.

5.2.2.2. Encouraging students' cooperation in "teams" and sharing of work on QQ. Jiehui emphasized group learning or working in "teams" in his class, but in different ways from Jing. He brought to Session 2 a "proposed team plan" and allowed students to adjust the allocation:

> Team 1, mainly computer science and technology; Team 2, signal processing; Team 3, microwave; Team 4, automation control, with one biomedical science student; Team 5, communication systems; and Team 6, microelectronics and optoelectronics. I understand that you have different interests; although you're in different disciplines, your topics may be related. So you can now decide whom you want to team up with. […] Our purpose is to encourage discussion in your team.

During class Jiehui would ask the students to work with their teammates to fulfill quick tasks. Prominently, the QQ online platform (www.qq.com), a popular social media sharing site in China, which students could access using their mobile phones, was employed in class as an instant sharing site of student work or parts of an ODA. To illustrate, early in Session 3, the class had a sharing and report-back time on their genre analysis assignment following Session 2: "Study the Abstract of an article in your discipline; for each element of an Abstract (i.e., Background, Purpose, Method, Results, and Conclusion), identify tense, sentence no., and phrases and patterns." Jiehui's instruction on the sharing and report-back task went:

> Share in your group. Then take a picture of an Abstract in your team using your phone and send to the QQ group. Ask a representative to share your analysis of the Abstract. You have five minutes to do the group work and then you share with the whole class.

A range of other tasks that Jiehui asked the student teams to perform and share on QQ had the following instructions:

- Discuss ODA titles and share one on QQ; a group representative should be prepared to comment on it when invited (Session 1)
- Check the opening sentence of an ODA, write a label for it in a few words (identify the move), and post to QQ with your name; move on to the next sentences and do the same (Session 4)

- Share the individual genre analysis assignment on Introduction within groups and then share with the whole class through QQ; a group representative should be prepared to talk about it when invited (Session 5)
- Check the Methods section in your ODA in terms of sub-headings, tenses, and voices; and then share with the whole class through QQ, with your name included (Session 7)

Notably, as seen above, the students were sometimes reminded to include their name with their QQ submission. This was Jiehui's incentive measure, for a teaching assistant had been asked to keep a record so that extra points could be awarded to individual students at the end of the semester for their participation.

5.3. The focal teachers' instruction on language

5.3.1. Jing's instruction

5.3.1.1. "There is rule you can follow". A focus on tense use was consistently part of Jing's instruction, reflecting the influence of a section on "tenses in a research paper" in the coursebook recommended to the students (Sun et al., 2012, pp. 195–197). In the spirit of the coursebook offering "rule[s] of thumb" (p. 195), Jing also outlined rules. For example, on teaching tense use in stating the research objective when writing an Abstract (Session 10), she advised:

> There is rule you can follow. When you state the objective, if you say "the purpose of this paper", you have to use present tense ["is"], because it's about this paper. […] But if you talk about "the investigation", it's better to use past tense, like "The purpose of the experiment", "The purpose of the analysis", "The purpose of this survey" "was" to.

In Session 10 Jing also reminded the class of the distinction between the use of present tense and past tense in stating the results of one's study when writing an Abstract (a distinction already made in Session 6 which focused on writing Discussion): that present simple indicates a conclusion being "universally true" and past tense indicates a conclusion being "locally true" (Sun et al., 2012, p. 197). Upon going through the concluding sentences in an Abstract which used past tense, Jing commented:

> So the conclusions are written in past tense, right? But can you use present tense to write the conclusions? […] They have different meanings. If you use present tense, it means that you want to emphasize the generalizability of the results, the conclusions, and show your confidence. But if you use past tense, you emphasize more on the results being locally true in the particular study.

It will be seen later that during his instruction Jiehui made a similar point regarding the use of tenses in concluding on one's research.

5.3.1.2. "Students need to learn how to use language correctly". As noted earlier, beyond move analysis, Jing believed in the importance of engaging students in hands-on writing practice and giving them feedback, including feedback on language:

> Move analysis sets up a framework for journal article publishing; but many micro-skills also need to be taught. Students need to learn how to use language correctly and we need to make them realize their gaps in language use. (Post-course interview)

She thus asked her students to group-write a short research paper and then revise based on peer and teacher feedback, as illustrated earlier. In her feedback to the class on the common problems in their writing (during the three "comments" sessions of 5, 9 and 10), she commented on both the content and language problems in students' writings. In Session 5, for example, she pulled out sentences from the students' drafts of Introduction to demonstrate a range of language problems:

- Inappropriate vocabulary choice
- Inaccuracies in the use of grammar, tense, and voice
- Mistakes in collocation, singular/plural forms, and subject-verb agreement
- Comma splices, incoherence and lack of clarity, and poor information flow
- Wrong register (using informal language)

Following Session 2 on Methods and Materials (M&M), Jing also gave an error correction assignment which asked the students to improve some sentences written by novices for the section.[6] Two examples from the assignment are shown as follows, concerning word choice and sentence structure respectively:

[6] The novice sentences were gathered by a colleague of Jing's, from some novice manuscripts that he helped to revise on request.

- X-rays presented the left diaphragmatic elevation in three cases. (*Replace the word "presented" with a more appropriate one.*)
- EMG was performed and, based on the combined findings of our clinical examination, a diagnosis total brachial plexus preganglionic injury was made. (*Improve the sentence by restructuring.*)

A group of students confirmed in a post-course interview that the language use errors brought up by Jing was indeed their weak point, as illustrated in Excerpt 2.

Excerpt 2

Student 1:	Chinese students like us are generally weak in grammar; after entering the university, we no longer study grammar as we did in high school. Grammar knowledge is gradually forgotten. The earlier assignment on improving the writing of some sentences was really difficult for me.
Student 2:	I think such exercises are quite good. We may overlook those mistakes. So those sentences selected from students' writings were really helpful.
Student 1:	The teacher can give us more of such exercise, to prepare us for that in the final assessment.
	(Post-course interview with the 2nd focus group)

In Excerpt 2, the students were referring to the error correction assignment following Session 2 and a final error correction task which would count into their final grade. On the whole, the students felt that error correction exercises were very helpful, by addressing their weaknesses in language use.

5.3.1.3. "Collect stock phrases". Jing's attention to stock phrases was seen throughout her instruction.[7] In her PowerPoint slides she would highlight stock phrases in her sentence examples used to illustrate particular moves. For instance, in Session 1, one sentence example was used to illustrate "Move 3. Stating the current research", with a stock phrase highlighted, as follows:

> **The purpose of this retrospective study was** to characterize the presentation, treatment, and outcomes of patients with multiple myeloma requiring surgical evaluation for abdominal pain.

Jing made it clear to the students that reusing stock phrases is not plagiarism but is a valuable language learning strategy. In fact, her very first assignment asked students to "Choose an article published after 2015 in your target journal, and pick out sentences in which a stock phrase is used and highlight the stock phrases (at least 20)." Then in the subsequent four genre analysis assignments, concerning Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion in sequence, she also asked students to highlight stock phrases in three of the assignments (it was not required in the assignment on Results).

5.3.2. Jiehui's instruction

5.3.2.1. "Forget about tense alignment". Like Jing, Jiehui also drew students' attention to tense use throughout his instruction. In Excerpt 3, he was reading from the Abstract of a paper published in *Science* (Talhelm et al., 2014).

Excerpt 3

[*Reference to the sentence "We tested 1162 Han Chinese participants in six sites and found that rice-growing southern China is more interdependent and holistic-thinking than the wheat-growing north."*]	
Jiehui:	"We tested 1162 Han Chinese participants in six sites and found that"—past simple. "rice-growing southern China is more interdependent"—what tense now?
Students:	Present tense.
Jiehui:	Right, "is", simple present. I remember I was very confused when I started to write research papers. How could "found" be followed by "is"? Isn't that tense misalignment? At *Gaokao* [College Entrance Examination] and Master's Program Entrance Examination, there are often such error correction items. Isn't tense misalignment a typical mistake? But we have "is" here! So from now on forget about tense alignment. Don't worry about it. Whether tenses should be aligned or not depends on needs.
[*Reference to the next two (ending) sentences "To control for confounds like climate, we tested people from neighboring counties along the rice-wheat border and found differences that were just as large. We also find that modernization and pathogen prevalence theories do not fit the data."*	
Jiehui:	[…] "found … were …" and "find that … do not". Can you see the difference? [students discussing] So we "found" something particular to this study; but "find" something that is universally true. […] You see the sophistication of a *Science* article? Small words, "find" or "found", convey the authors' intention.

[7] The coursebook recommended by Jing to the students (Sun et al., 2012) (as indicated in Table 1) defines "stock phrase" as "standard phrases" that "are easily recognizable because they are used repeatedly by different writers for similar purpose" (p. 198). In line with Sun et al. (2012), by "stock phrases" Jing implied that they tend to be associated with specific rhetorical moves and thus help to construct rhetorical purposes.

In the ending part of Excerpt 3, it is not clear whether the authors of the *Science* article consciously chose to shift from *found* to *find* in order to fulfill the kind of rhetorical purpose as suggested by Jiehui. However, the instructor's effort to make sense of the shift in the way he did, is noteworthy and would potentially enlighten the students. As a whole, Excerpt 3 illustrates how Jiehui, by referring to his own initial confusion when starting to write research papers, drew a line for the students between what was typically required in previous general English learning (tense alignment) and what he perceived to be the bending of the rule in research writing, where tenses can shift in a text to convey authors' rhetorical purposes. And like Jing, Jiehui similarly distinguished between the rhetorical contexts for results being reported in past tense versus being put forward in present tense.

5.3.2.2. "What a wonderful sentence!". As noted earlier, when conducting multilayered analysis of a text extract, Jiehui would frequently highlight language learning points (see Table 5). As further illustrated in Excerpt 4, he drew students' attention to language by praising some expressions in the beginning part of a paper (Cai, He, & Han, 2011), which had been used by Team 4 in their assignment of analyzing an Introduction. Jiehui described the Introduction as "a typical example", meaning that the conventional rhetorical moves of introductions were found in it; but he also implied at the same time that the flow of logic was conveyed through using language effectively. (In Excerpt 4, Jiehui's favorable highlights of language use in the sample text are underlined.)

Excerpt 4

[*Reference to the title "Speed Up Kernel Discriminant Analysis" of Cai et al. (2011)*]
Jiehui: "Speed Up Kernel Discriminant Analysis"—what a good title! [explaining 'speed up' in Chinese] The keywords here are "Discriminant Analysis" [giving Chinese].
[Reference to the 1st sentence of the Introduction: "Dimensionality reduction has been a key problem in many fields of information processing, such as data mining, information retrieval, and pattern recognition."]
Jiehui: "Dimensionality reduction", you see the paper opened with this; it echoes the title and is in the keywords too. "Has been a key problem", this is a standard gold medal expression; "has been a key problem in many fields of information processing"—what a wonderful sentence!
[Reference to the 2nd sentence: "When data is represented as points in a high-dimensional space, one is often confronted with tasks like nearest neighbor search."]
Jiehui: […] "One is often confronted with"—you should learn this expression; if we don't know it, we would write "we often have problems", right? This sentence pattern is important. It's effective. […]
[Reference to the 3rd sentence: "Many methods have been proposed to index the data for fast query response …"]
Jiehui: […] This is an introduction of many methods.
[Reference to the 4th sentence: "However, these methods can only operate with small dimensionality, typically less than 100."]
Jiehui: "However, these methods can only"—This is a classic flow of logic [by pointing out a gap in previous research].

In his text analysis Jiehui also brought up from time to time contrasts between what the paper authors did and what novices might do (e.g., in Excerpt 4, "if we don't know it, we would write 'we often have problems'"), to emphasize the need for novices to learn from the published authors.

5.3.2.3. "Build a phrasebank". Jiehui explicitly reminded students of reusable words and turns of phrases whenever there was a chance. Further to what is shown in Excerpt 4, on coming across words and expressions such as "*We refer the reader to Section 2 for a more detailed survey*" and "*The main contribution of this paper is*" (Session 5) during his multilayered text analysis, he urged the students to do the following:

- "Every time you read and see such expressions, mark it out, copy it down."
- "Every day you learn one phrase; 100 phrases in your field would make you sound like an expert."
- "When you read a paper, if you see something well-written, mark it out, save it and turn it into your own. Accumulate 3–5 from every paper is feasible."
- "Use this word ["*heterogeneous*"] next time to impress your supervisor, who will not regret recruiting you to be a supervisee!"

He encouraged his students to build a "phrasebank" (cf. Morley, 2008) to collect useful words and expressions, the benefits of which he highlighted as follows:

- "It helps you collect important patterns and phrases to use in your own writing"
- "The process of creating a phrasebank is a very good exercise to help strengthen your memory of key words"

For the format and use of such a phrasebank, he advised:

> Could be an e-version or paper version. E-version can be saved and you bring it everywhere you go. Paper version is also good, as it can be laid in front of you in the lab; it is like your vocabulary book in high school.

In other words, he wanted the novices to learn from "big shots":

> Accumulate expressions. If you want to express purpose, then find out how others say it, what big shots say; you follow suit. (Session 2)
>
> The method of learning academic writing is to align with excellent people—big shots, like IEEE fellows. You don't meet them in person, but you see what they wrote. However he writes, you follow; however he uses language, you use accordingly. (Session 3)

Jiehui's emphasis on learning language from published texts has a broad coverage. It evokes the notion of "textual mentor" as defined by Flowerdew and Wang (2017, p. 151): "a model source text or corpus of texts which is used to inform one's own writing".

6. Discussion

Focusing on the cases of two Chinese EAP instructors' classroom teaching, our study sought to answer the question *How did the two focal teachers go about conducting instruction in a genre-oriented graduate-level research writing course?* In the foregoing section we illustrated distinguishing features of the two focal teachers' classroom instruction and demonstrated how they emphasized language learning. In the following, we will aim to bring out some rationales behind the two focal teachers' pedagogies in the light of their local teaching context.

6.1. Setting "inductive and discovery-based genre analysis" as a long-term goal

While centrally concerned with raising students' rhetorical consciousness of the genre of research article, the two focal teachers' instruction did not match squarely the "inductive and discovery-based genre analysis" approach typically expounded upon in the EAP research writing pedagogy literature (e.g., Cheng, 2018; Swales & Feak, 2012). Jing noted that if there were more class time, she would prefer to adopt a more inductive approach, postponing her presentation of the moves and lexico-grammatical features of the individual sections of an article on her slides. Similarly, while a prominent feature of Jiehui's instruction was teacher-fronted multilayered text analysis, he observed that in the future he would create more time for students' ODA analysis and comparison across ODAs, before his analysis comes in. On reflection, perhaps the ambiguities and uncertainties that come with an approach of "inductive and discovery-based genre analysis" do not tend to encourage its adoption by novice teachers. In the Chinese context, we have reported novice EAP teachers at a PD program expressing diffidence in conducting genre analysis of the texts in students' disciplines (Li & Cargill, 2019). Yet the stance of being prepared to work toward "inductive and discovery-based genre analysis" as a long-term goal to be approximated in their future teaching on the part of both Jing and Jiehui, coupled with what they were already doing in their classrooms, seems to suggest a ready commitment to using genre analysis as a framework to propel their PD as EAP teachers in the long run (Cheng, 2015).

In contrast to "inductive and discovery-based genre analysis", the two teachers' classroom teaching demonstrates apparent 'localization' of this approach, based on their understanding of the classroom realities. In the case of Jiehui, for example, his somewhat teacher-centered multilayered text analysis gave weight to explanation and awareness-raising of language points (e.g., by giving Chinese translation or drawing attention to lexis or a cohesion link, as illustrated in Table 5). Jiehui's approach seems to cater to what he perceived to be the students' needs. He reflected: "I found my students prefer lecture-style teaching. They expect the teacher to be the sage on the stage and give them concrete knowledge as quickly as possible to save them time so they can digest the knowledge later." Jiehui's teacher-fronted multilayered text analysis approach resembles scenarios in a traditional (and still commonly found) "Intensive English Reading" class in Chinese universities, where instructors comb through a text sentence by sentence, and create teaching points whenever they see necessary. Being taken through journal articles (as opposed to texts in a traditional textbook) in this way probably gave Jiehui's students a learning experience that was both familiar and new.

6.2. Designing tasks appropriate to the students' stage of learning and based on local resources

Jing assigned a short group research paper writing task that the students needed to fulfill through topic selection and data collection (cf. Cargill et al., 2018). This approach of using a proxy writing task (as opposed to requiring manuscript preparation for publication) has been reported in the growing Chinese EAP literature (e.g., Zhang, 2013). Such a proxy task does not seem to address the students' immediate publication needs. Yet for EFL novice students in the early stage of their candidature, with no research data and still struggling with reading journal articles, a preparatory writing task (which gives them practice in writing the Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion), if properly built into the course, seems realistic while providing an authentic learning experience for the students and engaging their interest, as indicated in the case of Jing's teaching. The underlying logic echoes the idea of providing ongoing writing support to novices at different stages of their program (Feak, 2016); thus working on a manuscript for publication can be embedded into training at a later stage when the novices have data to write with (e.g., Li et al., 2018). In addition, Jing also incorporated elements of a "process" approach, whereby the students were required to improve drafts of their writing based on peer and teacher feedback. Jing's "process-genre" approach, again discussed in the Chinese EAP literature (e.g., Wu & Cui, 2016), seems to speak to the needs of English learners who would expect more scaffolding in the process of building writing competencies.

Jiehui used QQ (www.qq.com), a Chinese online platform accessible through mobile phone, as a pedagogical tool for instant sharing of materials and ODA analysis. The use of the tool, likewise having been reported in the Chinese EAP literature (e.g., Huang, 2010), provided a convenient means of collective learning for the class. Group learning, as used by both Jing and Jiehui, not only mirrors a common practice in the sciences (as pointed out by Jing), but also reflects the weight commonly accorded to peer feedback in writing for publication courses/programs.

6.3. Combining a linguistic approach with a genre approach

For both focal teachers, the issue of language has an important position in their instruction. On one level, they adopted a genre-based approach to language teaching, connecting tense use to rhetorical purposes and assigning tasks of collecting stock phrases that signal rhetorical moves. Yet other than this, in Jing's class, the short research paper writing task gave opportunities of providing feedback on language use, and error correction was part of the class teaching and assessment; and in Jiehui's class, students' attention was constantly drawn to language learning points in disciplinary texts and the value of a "phrasebank" for recording useful words and phrases (cf. Morley, 2008) was driven home. It seems their ways of addressing the issue of language went beyond the language teaching often featured in a genre-based approach (Cargill & O'Connor, 2013; Cheng, 2018; Swales & Feak, 2012). Xu (2019) commented in a recent article:

> […] genre teaching is very helpful for raising genre awareness, but not helpful enough for those who engage in WFP [writing for publication] to overcome the last mile problem—how to efficiently commit language options to memory so as to achieve a fluent and idiomatic control of language that manifests genre awareness. (p. 118)

Jing and Jiehui agreed with Xu, a Chinese colleague, on the importance of teaching language. To Jing: "Xu knows what Chinese students or novice writers lack concerns both the genre knowledge and language competence/writing competence." Similarly, to Jiehui: "We cannot just focus on genre as genre itself varies a lot across academic disciplines. Our students come to the EFL class above all to improve their English language ability. This is more difficult than genre knowledge and awareness. At the end of the day, it's students' English ability that is at the core to affect their academic writing quality." Thus Jing and Jiehui concur with Xu's (2019) proposal of "specific language acquisition methods be[ing] employed in the genre approach", or combining a "linguistic approach" with the genre approach (p. 118). Yet while Xu (2019) associated "linguistic approach" with memorization, and illustrated its operation with a case of a Chinese linguist who achieved "automatization in producing multiword sequences that meet genre conventions of journal articles" (p. 128) through memorizing sections of published articles, from Jing and Jiehui's perspective, a focus on memorization is unrealistic and inefficient for their busy students. By contrast, other than stressing upon collecting "stock phrases" (Jing) or "phrases and patterns" (Jiehui), which are "multiword sequences", the two teachers incorporated other linguistic strategies too to engage students in language learning. In short, they combined a linguistic approach with a genre approach in their own ways.

The teacher participants in Tardy's (2017) study adopted genre pedagogy in teaching academic writing to first-year university students but felt under-equipped to address the issue of language in class. We wonder if teachers in EFL contexts, like Jing and Jiehui, despite being relatively novice as EAP instructors, might have some advantage when it comes to addressing the issue of language in teaching (Li & Ma, 2018). These novice EAP instructors are informed by their "practical experience", which, as Campion (2016, p. 67) pointed out, is in a "symbiotic" relationship with what they have learned through PD opportunities. In the cases of Jing and Jiehui, we saw evidence of such symbiosis, which impacted upon their classroom instruction.

7. Conclusion

In this paper we presented a case study of two novice Chinese EAP teachers' instructional practices in teaching graduate-level research writing. Overall, their instruction illustrates localized ESP genre-based pedagogy. We provided evidence of their setting "inductive and discovery-based genre analysis" as a long-term goal to be approximated, designing tasks appropriate to the students' stage of learning and based on local resources, and combining a linguistic approach with a genre approach. These practices, together with their using journal articles from the students' own disciplines as teaching materials, created for the students some common ground for learning, practicing and sharing.

As noted earlier in this paper, the two novice EAP instructors in our study are both PhD holders and have research publication experience. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Jing commented on her students' inadequate questionnaire design and lack of alignment between sections, while Jiehui referred to his own experience of feeling puzzled by 'tense misalignment' when starting to do research writing himself. From this perspective, despite their limited training in EAP, they already had relevant genre knowledge and their level of preparedness in teaching a graduate-level EAP research writing course was probably relatively high, enabling them to teach the course with a higher level of competence and confidence than their counterparts who have had little research training and publication experience (Li & Cargill, 2019). Our two focal teachers were thus perhaps *atypical* novice EAP instructors, and our findings in the study will need to be interpreted with caution against this backdrop.

The study reported in this paper mediated the joint professional development of the research team. For both the first author who has been more of an EAP researcher than an EAP teacher, and the second author who is a fresh PhD graduate only starting to teach graduate-level research writing, to obtain insights into colleagues' classroom instruction is a humbling

experience. For Jing and Jiehui, participating as co-researchers in this study provided an opportunity to reflect upon their classroom practices, while potentially introducing catalytic validity (Burns, 1999, p. 162) into the study, by encouraging continued PD on their part and even changes to their existing practices in the future.

Scholarship on genre-oriented graduate-level research writing instruction is still rather limited. By choosing to focus on making sense of two focal teachers' classroom instruction, our study did not look into the efficacy of the instruction and the students' learning. This can be taken up in future research. Ultimately, rich stories of classroom instruction will inform and enhance EAP teachers' training and their endeavors of professional development.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the constructive feedback of the anonymous reviewers and Hilary Nesi on earlier versions of this paper. The study reported in this paper was supported by a Seed Fund for Basic Research from The University of Hong Kong, China (Project Code 201611159043).

References

Budgell, B. S. (2009). *Writing a biomedical research paper: A guide to structure and style*. Tokyo: Springer.
Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cai, D., He, X., & Han, J. (2011). Speed up kernel discriminant analysis. *The VLDB Journal : The International Journal on Very Large Data Bases, 20*(1), 21–33.
Campion, G. C. (2016). The learning never ends': Exploring teachers' views on the transition from General English to EAP. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 23*, 59–70.
Cargill, M., Gao, X., Wang, X., & O'Connor, P. (2018). Preparing Chinese graduate students of science facing an international publication requirement for graduation: Adapting an intensive workshop approach for early-candidature use. *English for Specific Purposes, 52*, 13–26.
Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2013). *Writing scientific research articles: Strategy and steps* (2nd ed.). Hackensack, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
Cheng, A. (2015). Genre analysis as a pre-instructional, instructional, and teacher development framework. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 19*, 125–136.
Cheng, A. (2018). *Genre and graduate-level research writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
Feak, C. B. (2016). EAP support for post-graduate students. In K. Hyland, & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 489–501). London & New York: Routledge.
Flowerdew, J., & Wang, S. H. (2017). Teaching English for research publication purposes with a focus on genre, register, textual mentors and language reuse: A case study. In J. Flowerdew, & T. Costley (Eds.), *Discipline-specific writing: Theory into practice* (pp. 144–161). London: Routledge.
Glasman-Deal, H. (2010). *Science research writing for non-native speakers of English*. London: Imperial College Press.
Han, J., & Qin, X. (2000). Ticai fenxi yu ticai jiaoxue fa [Genre analysis and genre pedagogy]. *Wai Yu Jie [Foreign Language World]*, (1), 11–18.
Huang, P. (2010). Yanjiusheng xueshu yingyu jiaoliu jineng de peiyang [On developing the communicative competence in academic English among postgraduate students]. *Xuewei Yu Yanjiusheng Jiaoyu [Academic Degrees & Graduate Education]*, (8), 55–59.
Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 148–164.
Kuteeva, M. (2013). Graduate learners' approaches to genre-analysis tasks: Variations across and within four disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes, 32*(2), 84–96.
Li, Y., & Cargill, M. (2019). Observing and reflecting in an ERPP "master class": Learning and thinking about application. In J. Corcoran, K. Englander, & L. Muresan (Eds.), *Pedagogies and policies on publishing research in English: Local initiatives supporting international scholars* (pp. 143–160). London & New York: Routledge.
Li, Y., Cargill, M., Gao, X., Wang, X., & O'Connor, P. (2019). A scientist in interdisciplinary team-teaching in an English for Research Publication Purposes classroom: Beyond a "cameo role". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 40*, 129–140.
Li, Y., Flowerdew, J., & Cargill, M. (2018). Teaching English for research publication purposes to science students in China: A case study of an experienced teacher in the classroom. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 35*, 116–129.
Li, Y., & Ma, X. (2018). Teaching English academic writing to graduate students across disciplines at Chinese universities. In X. You (Ed.), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 222–243). New York & London: Routledge.
Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Morley, J. (2008). Writing support in British higher education: An institutional case study. In P. Friedrich (Ed.), *Teaching academic writing* (pp. 125–146). London: Continuum.
Simpson, S., Caplan, N. A., Cox, M., & Phillips, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Supporting graduate student writers: Research, curriculum, and program design*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Starfield, S. (2016). Supporting doctoral writing at an Australian university. *Writing & Pedagogy, 8*(1), 177–198.
Sun, Q., Tang, W., & Wang, S. (2012). *Practical medical English writing*. Shanghai: Fudan University Press.
Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Talhelm, T., Zhang, X., Oishi, S., Shimin, C., Duan, D., Lan, X., et al. (2014). Large-scale psychological differences within China explained by rice versus wheat agriculture. *Science, 344*, 603–608.
Tardy, C. M. (2017). The challenge of genre in the academic writing classroom: Implications for L2 writing teacher education. In J. Bitchener (Ed.), *Teaching writing for academic purposes to multilingual students: Instructional approaches* (pp. 69–83). New York: Routledge.
Wang, S., & Wang, H. (2011). Woguo gaoxiao daxue yingyu jiaoxue xianzhuang diaocha ji daxue yingyu jiaoxue gaige yu fazhan fangxiang [On the state of College English teaching in China and its future development]. *Zhongguo Waiyu [China Foreign Language], 8*(5), 4–11. & 17.
Wu, W., & Cui, G. (2016). Guocheng ticai jiaoxuefa zai yingyu wenxian zongshu xiezuo jiaoxue zhong de shijian yanjiu [Using process-genre approach in teaching literature review writing in English]. *Jiefangjun Waiguoyu Xueyuan Xuebao [Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages], 39*(2), 73–81.
Xu, F. (2019). Learning the language to write for publication: The nexus between the linguistic approach and the genre approach. In P. Habibie, & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Novice writers and scholarly publication: Authors, mentors, gatekeepers* (pp. 117–134). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
Zhang, P. (2013). Xiaozu xiezuo xiangmu qudong renwu fenjie—shuoshi yanjiusheng xueshu yingyu jiaoliu nengli peiyang de jiaogai shijian [group work, project-driven, task-based: A pedagogical initiative to develop master students' communicative competence in academic English. *Xuewei Yu Yanjiusheng Jiaoyu [Academic Degrees & Graduate Education]*, (7), 33–37.

Yongyan Li is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, China. Her research focuses on second language writing in disciplines, scholarly research and publication, and academic writing/publishing pedagogies. She has published extensively on her research, including in *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* and journals of higher education.

Xiaohao Ma is a lecturer in the School of Foreign Language Education of Jilin University, China. She is interested in research of English for Academic Purposes, academic language and literacy development, and L2 academics and students writing in English.

Jing Zhao is a lecturer of medical English in the College of Foreign Languages and Literature in Fudan University, China. Her teaching areas include medical research paper writing, academic English for medical purposes, and spoken medical English. Her research interest focuses on academic writing and teaching English for Research Publication Purposes.

Jiehui Hu is a professor at the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, China. He researches the cognitive neuroscience of language and second language acquisition. He has also been doing practitioner research in academic writing and technology-enhanced blended learning.