Genre Analysis and the Advanced Second Language Writer

CHAPTER · JANUARY 2002

CITATIONS
15

READS
55

2 AUTHORS, INCLUDING:

John M. Swales
University of Michigan
132 PUBLICATIONS **3,831** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

CHAPTER 6

Genre Analysis and the Advanced Second Language Writer

John M. Swales
University of Michigan
Margaret A. Luebs
Institute for Telecommunication Science

In 1996, Charney published a trenchant defense of research-informed studies in composition under the title of "Empiricism is not a four-letter word" in *College Composition and Communication* (*CCC*). The irony of this literacy event has not passed unnoticed because CCC is one of those journals, like *The Journal of Advanced Composition*, that in recent years has privileged scholarly essays or opinion pieces about the parlous state of the field at the expense of empirical studies, including those centered on discourse analysis. In the broad field of English as a Second Language (ESL), and in the narrower one of English for Academic Purposes (EAP), Charney's spirited defense of situated studies of what is actually happening with particular writers and their texts would seem unnecessary, if only because the overwhelming majority of papers published in its leading journals such as *Applied Linguistics* and *English for Specific Purposes* report on research findings, including many deriving from discourse analysis.

In a further irony, there is now lively debate in EAP, originally sparked by Santos, about whether this movement, in its zeal to

capture the discoursal properties of disciplinary fields and academic genres, has not in fact become the captured handmaiden of institutional practices and percepts. The main charge leveled against EAP practitioners is that their investigations of non-native speaker (NNS) academic and communicative needs has lulled them into a "vulgar" rather than a "critical" pragmatism (cf. Allison, Pennycook). In other words, EAP's very determination to get close to the textures and patterns of disciplinary discourses has prevented the field from appreciating the coercive effects and ideological underpinnings of those discourses. Although the final outcome of this debate is unclear, much current pedagogical thinking in EAP looks for NNS student empowerment and support within institutional expectations and conventions. For example, Barks and Ostermann, in their work with international students studying for a master's degree in architecture, attempt to deconstruct traditionally eurocentric accounts of the history of the field, to encourage their students to write about their own countries' architectural heritages, and to prepare them for rigors and traumas of the "juried defense" of their studio designs.

OVERVIEW

Although *genre* is a complex and abstract notion often prone to simplification and reduction and often characterized in different ways (cf. Berkenkotter & Huckin, Johns), the concept has proved highly attractive to those working in EAP, especially for those working with graduate students. Academic genre categories (term paper, research article, conference abstract, dissertation, etc.) after all comprise a terminological set that all members of the academy use on a regular basis (unlike the specialized labels of linguistics and rhetoric). Second, genres are widely regarded as conceptual and curricular building blocks of "the right size," in the sense that they are more manageable than broader labels such as "scientific language" or "expository prose," and less artificial than "compare-and-contrast" paragraphs. Third, once applied discourse analysts began in the 1980s to reconstruct their databases away from the sampling of random textual extracts toward the accumulation of whole genre exemplars, they began to pay attention to the different functions and forms of parts of a genre, such as the classic IMRD structure of scientific papers (Bazerman, *Shaping Written Knowledge*; Swales, *Genre Analysis*). Fourth, in more recent years, attention has also focused on particular linguistic and functional features within genres and part genres, such as hedging (Hyland), theme (Gosden, "Discourse

Functions"), metadiscourse (Mauranen), citation (Bloch and Chi), reporting verbs (Thompson and Ye), and imperatives (Swales et al.). Fifth, the genre movement has begun to intersect well with those who are interested in comparing academic and professional discourse across cultures and languages (see Connor for a comprehensive review). Finally, recent, if belated, moves to consider individual genres not so much as isolatable text types, but rather as elements in generic systems and sets (Bazerman, *Constructing Experience*; Paltridge; Swales, *Other Floors*) has consolidated current interests in intertextual links and connections.

The emphasis on genre in applied linguistic discourse analysis since the mid-1980s has also served to create a connection, especially since EAP's discovery of Miller's seminal 1984 article, "Genre as Social Action," with leading discoursal researchers and theorists in rhetoric and composition (e.g., Freedman and Medway). This in turn opened the door to influences from the sociologists of knowledge, although few in the EAP field have followed sociologists such as Latour and Woolgar, and Potter, or rhetorical theorists such as Gross all the way down the social constructionist road to a position where "facts" are simply and inevitably constructed out of epistomological alignments and allegiances. In some contrast, most applied linguists, whether working in monolingual or multilingual contexts, would likely ascribe to a position akin to Rudwick's in his account of a 19th-century geological dispute, as described here:

> The outcome of research is neither the unproblematic disclosure of the natural world nor the mere artifact of social negotiation. . . . For the Devonian controversy shows new knowledge is shaped from the materials of a real natural world, malleable yet often refractory; but it becomes knowledge only as these materials are forged into new shapes with new meanings, on the anvil of heated argumentative debate. (454)

On the other side of the ledger, a number of fine-grained studies of the academy and its denizens have complicated the pictures we might have of the processes of textual appropriation and acquisition. Although the *metaphor* of climbing a generic ladder—with steps of escalating communicative demand—is attractive as a rhetorical depiction of academic progress toward degree, it does not always accord well with certain realities on the ethnographic ground. Belcher, Casanave, and particularly Prior have argued that strong text approaches tend to be too cerebral, too discoursal and too hierarchical. Prior stresses, in his studies of graduate seminars, that disciplinary enculturation can be an uncertain process, highly dependent

on local and interpersonal factors. Even though such conclusions and observations provide a useful corrective, it remains unclear whether the unstable and highly contingent processes of genre acquisition that Prior and others have uncovered would extend to, say, research groups in other fields or to graduate seminars in disciplines with more settled methodologies.

The foregoing then has been an (updated) account of the kind of mindset common to applied linguists working in advanced EAP at the end of the century. In this account, we have also hinted at the foundational role of linguistic and discoursal analysis in this tradition, however much in more recent years this has become supplemented by other kinds of more contextual and ethnographic evidence. The standard methodologies used in this kind of work are most easily accessible in Swales' *Genre Analysis* and Bhatia's *Analysing Genre,* and are illustrated in the latter half of this chapter.

CASE STUDY: ASIAN DOCTORAL STUDENTS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

In April 1996, Swales, as director of the English Language Institute (ELI) and instructor of the ELI's most advanced writing courses for international graduate students at the University of Michigan, was approached by two senior professors in social psychology to see if a special summer course could be run for a group of their Asian doctoral students. As one of the professors observed in the initial meeting, "These are very bright students, and they have enough English to get a degree, but do they have enough English to get a job in this country?" (They went on to explain that social psychology tended to be very under-developed in the students' home countries with consequently very few position openings.) A scheme of summer work with a three-part focus was soon agreed in outline: a writing course to be taught by us; individual consultations on writing to be conducted by Luebs, who had considerable experience in this area both in the ELI and in the Program for Technical Communication on the engineering campus; and individual help on speaking organized through Professor Joan Morley's ESL Speech Clinic. We also asked psychology to provide an American doctoral student to act as a specialist informant and assistant, a role ably played by Heather Coon.

Agreement was reached in early May and the course component was scheduled to run for 6 hours a week from early June to mid-July. Meanwhile, Luebs was in the throes of finishing, defending, and revising her dissertation (on a different topic, the rhetoric of

transcription), and Swales had various competing demands for his time, including supporting Margaret through the final weeks of her dissertation odyssey. Given these severe time constraints, we decided that this would have to be a *blitzkrieg* operation, rather than a relaxed and scholarly exploration of the discourse of psychology. It would have to be very different to Bazerman's (*Constructing Experience*) account of what is required "to understand current patterns of language use in contemporary psychology" (109). Bazerman's account, *inter alia*, would involve tracing the field's emergence out of philosophy and physiology, its shaping by successively dominant theories and approaches, and examining how psychological discourses are variously imbricated with and affected by neighboring fields such as medicine, psychiatry, sociology, and public health.

A scramble through the literature provided relatively little except for the chapters by Bazerman and Carlston in Nelson, Megill, and McCloskey's edited volume. In fact, we were quite shocked by the lack of studies in applied linguistics devoted to psychology texts, certainly in comparison to other fields such as economics and biology. We rapidly came to the conclusion that we would need to do some hurried primary discourse analysis and, after consultation with psychology faculty, we adopted as a corpus for this purpose current issues of *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (*JPSP*) and its somewhat slighter sister *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* (*PSPB*). These were, we were told, the top American Psychological Association (APA) journals in the field of experimental social psychology. Many of the long articles in *JPSP* are "multi-study," and here is what the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (4th ed.) has to say about these:

> If you are integrating several experiments in one paper, describe the method and results of each experiment separately. If appropriate, include for each experiment a short discussion of the results, or combine the discussion with the description of results (e.g., Results and Discussion). Always make the logic and rationale of each new experiment clear to the reader. Always include a comprehensive general discussion of all the work after the last experiment. (19)

And, naturally enough, the key secondary source would be the authoritative and much-consulted *APA Publication Manual* itself. However, ~~as is seen here~~, as our analyses proceeded and as the class discussions unfolded, divergences between prescriptions and practices would emerge in sufficient numbers to raise doubts about the manual's de facto status as a "rule book."

tures" (Barton, this volume) that set these texts apart from other empirical research articles and thus gave them their particular identity. We might even, we supposed, be able to use these surface features, such as meticulous and highly detailed methodological descriptions, to raise questions about underlying beliefs, conventions, and expectations.

In our preparations, it became gradually apparent to us that an additional key genre for graduate students in most areas of psychology was the conference poster. It also transpired that this genre had evolved a very tight set of conventions, regarding such matters as the font size of the title, the number of sheets and their size, and the importance of having at least one striking visual to act as a magnet for the peripatetic reader's attention. Because Heather had considerable experience with this genre, she ran the introductory session devoted to conference posters. We subsequently decided that the culmination of the course would be a poster conference presenting the participants' work, to which we would invite our colleagues from the ELI, other students from psychology, and the two senior professors who had initiated the special course. Hence, Margaret devoted part of her individual consultancies to the preparation of these. The final twist to these developments was that, albeit belatedly, Margaret and I decided to produce a poster ourselves for the final session in which we would summarize our *own* research findings. We reproduce it here in exactly its 1996 form.

Research Articles in Social Psychology: A Preliminary Discourse Analysis

John Swales & Margaret Luebs
The University of Michigan

Titles

- Titles of research articles often consist of two clauses connected with a colon. In a survey of 94 articles in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60% were of this type. (Among 231 conference poster titles, only 34% were of this type.)
- The APA Manual recommends that titles be 10-12 words. Two-clause titles in JPSP averaged 12.6 words (range: 8-22); one-clause titles averaged 8.37 (range: 1-16).
- One-clause titles typically stated the topic of the article (82%). Only rarely did they state the conclusion (6%).
- Two-clause titles often followed the pattern General: Specific. Sometimes the general clause was noticeably more "catchy" than the other; the APA Manual suggests that titles "summarize the main idea of the paper simply, and if possible, with style." Example: "Us and Them: Mood Effects on Intergroup Discrimination."

Abstracts

- According to the APA Manual, journal abstracts should summarize the article, including (for an empirical study) the problem, subjects method, results (including statistical significance levels), and conclusions/implications. However, in *JPSP* and *PSPB*, abstracts consist primarily of results and conclusions, with little or no information about subjects and method, and *no* statistical significance levels.
- Authors avoid personal pronouns (I, we) at all costs in journal abstracts, but vary in their preference for the passive ("It was shown...") or a non-personal subject ("The study showed..."). Occasionally authors even refer to themselves in the third person ("The authors hypothesized...").
- Present tense is often used to describe the problem (in the first sentence) and to discuss the implications (in the last sentence). Elsewhere the past tense is used almost exclusively.

Introductions

- In *JPSP* and *PSPB*, most introductions follow Swales' (1990) Create-A-Research-Space (CARS) model quite closely. Typically the model's three moves are completed in (as the APA Manual recommends for entire Introductions) "a paragraph or two."
- However, Introductions in *JPSP* (and *PSPB*) usually do not stop after Move 3. Instead, they continue on for several more pages in order to include "all the theory" required by JPSP reviewers. These "introduc-

possible criticisms from readers. Indeed, the APA Manual hints at this secondary function of Results sections when it instructs authors to "report the data in sufficient detail to justify the conclusions." In *JPSP* and *PSPB*, Results and Discussion are regularly intertwined; in fact, some articles have a combined section entitled "Results and Discussion" for each study, followed by a "General Discussion" of the entire group of studies.

- Visual aids, especially very detailed tables, play an important role in *JPSP* and *PSPB* Results sections. As shown in Table 1 below, of the 135 visual elements in 21 articles in *JPSP* and *PSPB*, 123 (91%) were found in the Results sections (or "results and Discussion"). Of these 123 elements, 86 (70%) were tables.

Table 1: Type and Location of Visual Elements, in 21 articles in *JPSP* and *PSPB*

Element Type	Introduction	Method	Results	Discussion	Appendix	Totals
Tables	1	4	86		2	93
Line Graphs			30	1		31
Bar Graphs			2			2
Other Graphs			1			1
Charts	4		4			8
Total Elements	5	4	123	1	2	135

- Authors have their own preferences for particular verbs and constructions linking verbal and nonverbal elements in the Results. The most common constructions are the Linking As Clause with 30% ("As shown in Figure 3"), Table/Figure as subject with 26% ("Table 2 shows"), the passive with 23% ("The results are shown in Table 1), and the imperative with 16% ("See Figure 2"). The two most widely used verbs are *show* (35.5%) and *see* (34.5%), with *present* a distant third (10%).

After the Results

- The post-Results sections are more variable than predicted. For example, of the 13 articles in the May 1996 issue of *JPSP*, 6 had one "discussion" section, 6 had two, and one had three: *Discussion, General Discussion, Conclusion*. Further, three of the papers discussed each single study individually, but ten did not.
- This variability is also shown by the presence or absence of sub-sectional headings in *Discussions and General Discussions*; of the 15 sections so titled, 8 had sub-heads, but 7 were unbroken text.

- The topics covered in these sections contained many expected elements, such as reviewing the main "findings" (*findings*, rather than *results* or *data*, being the noun of choice), discussing limitations, and offering suggestions for further research. On the other hand, we were struck by the amount of advocacy in some papers, where the authors were at pains to claim, and sometimes reclaim, that their findings were *important* and/or *noteworthy*.

Our Own Conclusions

- The APA Publication Manual is typically assumed to have a powerful, even coercive effect on the shaping of research texts in Psychology. It seems, however, that rhetorically-enterprising social psychologists can succeed in "getting away with their own things," as in eccentric placements of non-verbal material, unusual arrangements of introductory material, and in repeating the virtues of their papers in multi-section Discussions. Only in Methods does the APA Manual consistently prevail.
- Bazerman (1988), in one of the few rhetorical studies of Psychology research articles, observes:

> The method section is a totally different entity from the introduction and the results. Although problem, methods and results must correlate at some level, the author escapes the need to demonstrate the coherence of the enterprise (p. 260).

- Our study provides support for the first observation, but not the second. *Discussion and General Discussion* are indeed used "to demonstrate the coherence of the enterprise."

COMMENTARY

While preparing this chapter for publication almost exactly 2 years after the analyses summarized in the poster took place, we initially concluded that we had indeed been able to put to efficient use our skills in discourse analysis and our experiences of EAP. Given the limited time available, our poster seemed to cover a surprising amount of ground, and to display some useful linguistic observations, often supported by quantitative data. This last, of course, we had emphasized in order to convince the psychology participants and their advisors that we too were capable of solid empirical work! A little further reflection, however, revealed that our modestly subtitled "preliminary discourse analysis" did not penetrate very far into the core epistemologies of experimental social psychology. Most particularly, because a majority of participants were working on cross-cultural topics in the field, we were puzzled as to how social psychology saw itself in relation to cultural anthropology and linguistic anthropology. In fact, it was only in 1998, when we read the transcript of the dissertation defense of one of our participants—and coincidentally chaired by one of the two senior professors—did matters become clearer. This delayed epiphany occurred when the chair observed in relation to the anthropologists, "I fully understand their complexity; I don't understand why they can't understand my simplicity." Here then was the explanation for the different manipulations of a simple experimental variable in multistudy papers.

When we reviewed the poster, we were particularly struck by our strong claim in the "After the Results" section about *JPSP* authors' *advocacy* of the importance or noteworthiness of their own research findings. We wondered in particular whether this self-promotionalism might be an artifact of the smallish sample. The issue is, in fact, not a trivial one because in our specific pedagogic context there are repeated claims that collectivist tendencies in East Asian cultures are liable to lead to disapproval of individuals who "blow their own horn" (Belcher and Braine; Scollon and Scollon). Such advocacy might thus, we surmised, be a specific locus of compositional difficulty and psychological tension for our ex-participants and their comparable cohorts.

In consequence, we have since examined a further continuous run of 25 articles in *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (all 19 in the February 1998 issue and the first 6 from the March issue). Of these, 5 had no distinctive self-promotional language, at least as perceived through the lens of what we might expect to find in journals in our own field. Five more made some fairly muted and not immodest claims about the presented work, such as:

- ...the present research offers a more complex view of how...
- The results of this study provide a complex perspective on...

However, the remaining 15 (60%) went considerably further. Here is a small selection:

- The findings of this study extend our understanding of adult romantic attachment styles...
- We would contend that these outcomes have implications for other trauma groups.
- Our results are revealing. (tout court!)
- As a consequence, I propose an entirely different, feedforward connectionist model that shows more promise for several reasons.
- ...we provided in this article a comprehensive analysis of two components...
- This allowed us to overcome one limitation of previous research...
- Thus, these studies provide the first empirical evidence...these findings tell us something new about...
- The implications of the present research extend well beyond our rather specific concerns about...

The tenor of observations such as those just presented brings us back to that stalwart, the *APA Publication Manual*. At the close of the subsection on discussion, the manual states:

> In general, be guided by the following questions:
>
> - What have I contributed here?
> - How has my study helped to resolve the original problem?
> - What conclusions and theoretical implications can I draw from my study?
>
> The responses to these questions are the core of your contribution, and readers have the right to clear, unambiguous and direct answers. (19)

It would, therefore, seem that a majority of *JPSP* authors in the 1998 corpus have adopted these recommendations with surprising enthusiasm. It almost seems as though they have seized on an opportunistic license to expatiate on the value of their own contributions. Further research would be helpful here, both diachronic and contextual, since this kind of advocacy would seem to be one of Barton's "rich features" (this volume) that might be used to establish a rhetorical difference

between social psychology and other fields. Other differentiating "rich feature" elements can be gleaned from our poster, such as the redetailing of methods in multistudies, and the heavy use of pre-emptive purpose statements in methods sections.

More generally, our descriptive and linguistic excursion into the discourse of social psychology has accumulatively undermined the *rhetorical* recommendations in the APA manual. In some cases, and very much to our surprise, they are not consistently followed; in others, as in the immediately previous case, they would seem to have been interpreted in a self-advantageous manner; and in others, the recommendations themselves are inconsistent. For example, in the section on the Introduction, the manual on page 11 advises the writer to both "assume that the reader has knowledge in the field for which you are writing and does not require a complete digest," while on the next page it recommends the writer to "develop the problem with enough breadth and clarity to make it generally understood by as wide a professional audience as possible." Hartley has also shown that the placement of nonverbal materials such as tables and charts does not always follow the advice in the manual, and something of these inconsistencies can be detected in the table in our poster.

There is a long tradition in discourse research, aspects of it well represented in this volume, that has consistently pointed to the fact that certain grammatical and rhetorical recommendations in textbooks and manuals are in reality "more honoured in the breach than in the observance" (cf. Berkenkotter and Huckin). We have found this to be true in our small and pedagogically driven study of research articles in social psychology. Unfortunately, the wider applications of these studies are largely lost. There is all too little evidence that authors of writing manuals and textbooks ever bother to search out empirical studies in order to revise and rectify their advice. A typical case is Day's hugely popular *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper* (now in its fifth edition), which, in its various iterations, has, to our knowledge, never taken account of any of the numerous descriptive studies on the actual discoursal and linguistic characteristics of the very important genre to which it is devoted.

The final topic in this section relates to the subsequent careers of our seven participants. By late 1999, four had graduated: one left in 1997 for an assistant professorship at Berkeley; a second was one of five 1997 Distinguished Dissertation Award winners at the university, where she stayed for a year as a postdoctorate student before taking a position at the University of Washington; a third left in summer 1998 for an assistant professorship at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; and a fourth had just defended. The four other students—we have lost contact with the visiting scholar—

are all still at Michigan, two are completing their dissertations and are currently on the job market. One of these already has several campus interviews liked up for a tenure-track position as an organizational psychologist in a leading business school, and the other is looking for a similar position in a school of social work. Both have impressive multipage vitaes. The final two we believe to have achieved candidacy. Overall, this is an impressive and successful cohort, and we feel grateful for having had an opportunity to make a small contribution to their academic progress and success. Some of these students we never saw again in the ELI; others have taken further advanced courses, made consistent use of the ELI's Writing Lab for one-on-one help, or continue to patronize the first author's office hours. So maybe, by one route or another, most have acquired or are on the way to acquiring "enough English to get a job."

CONCLUSION: SUGGESTIONS FOR RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

At one level, the purpose of this chapter has been to illustrate what "a quick-and-dirty" discourse analysis can reveal about published writing in one social science subfield, that of experimental social psychology. We would argue that discoursal studies of the disciplinary surface can be particularly valuable for discussion, for metacognition and for rhetorical consciousness-raising. The revelations about actual discoursal practice additionally show something about how discoursal and linguistic choices are socially constructed in particular fields. But if we succeeded in rapidly putting together a one-off short experimental course described, this is essentially because of our experience in observing larger and smaller patterns in the discourse of a chosen genre, plus perhaps some acquired knack in constructing challenging activities and tasks based on those observations. If we "made it" in the early summer of 1996, it was not because of detailed knowledge of the field of psychology, or because of technical expertise in linguistic analysis, or a capacity to bring rhetorical theory to the texts in question. We essentially followed Wittgenstein's famous dictum, "Don't think, but look," and by looking for as long as time allowed, found some things to say and to teach.

Student reactions to the course were somewhat variable but generally favorable. As is commonly found at this level, there was universal praise for the individual consultations. Several wished the class had been more intensive, and regretted that we had not dealt with such things as strategies for constructing tables and figures.

(Rather beyond our expertise we thought.) Most relevant here perhaps were the responses to the linguistic and discoursal analyses. After some initial confusion, most, though by no means all, really got into the swing of this. Here are two end-of-course comments: "[the] analyses of psychology articles were very intuitive and interesting"; "I'm more interested in the English language than before. I used to enjoy the lessons on my own language at home and I realized some of the same themes coming up in this class."

On another level, we hope that the broader context of this study—and its framing commentaries—might offer some pointers to our composition colleagues, particularly with regard to what more they might be doing to help graduate students, both native and non-native speakers, in their own institutions. As background, we could first observe that one strand in EAP work (Swales, *Genre Analysis,* and many of the chapters in Belcher and Braine's volume) has stressed the political and academic advantages of moving beyond its institutional heartland of prematriculated international students and incoming freshmen to provide more support for advanced graduate students, graduate students in professional colleges, and the needs of international teaching assistants (see the comprehensive bibliography on the last by Briggs et al.). The advantages claimed for this expansion include consolidating a Writing Across the Curriculum research tradition, enhancing academic status as symbolized, for instance, by the offering of courses that can merit graduate credit, and better networking with senior, and often influential, professorial faculty.

And yet as discourse analysts and teachers and tutors of international graduate student writing, we have remained perplexed that rhetoric and composition (although probably excluding business and technical communication) seems, across much of the country, to have declined or resisted opportunities to offer courses in academic writing for graduate students, native speakers, or combined native and non-native speakers. This is particularly puzzling because there are widespread perceptions that many native-speaker graduate students also struggle with their academic writing, and for all sorts of reasons, a number not unconnected with increased communicative demands placed on them by the generic academic ladder.

A clear instance of such anxieties occurred in fall 1998, when Swales and a graduate student from the School of Information were asked by Michigan's graduate school to offer a workshop on "Literature Searches and Reviews." Publicity for this 90-minute session was late and not that intensive. Swales, who was responsible for the main component on how to write literature reviews, prepared 30 handouts. More than 200 students attended, a clear majority being

apparently native speakers of English. After the workshop, in both conversation and in subsequent e-mail messages and meetings, it became clear that not inconsiderable numbers of American doctoral students in highly selective programs at a major research institution were close to being traumatized by the unknown exigencies of this problematic part genre (Swales and Lindemann) and by the fact that they were members of an educational generation that had never been taught the rudiments of traditional grammar.

Meanwhile, in many research institutions, non-native speaker international graduate students tend to be better served by the available language-support systems; indeed, there are signs that classes in non-native speaker dissertation writing and the like are spreading quite fast, at least at major public research universities. And to close on a more political note, composition's seeming reluctance to offer writing courses in its liberal arts and sciences colleges does, in our view, very little to advance the field's status; instead, it tends to merely confirm opinions in college administrations that composition has nothing useful to offer at this level. Against this backdrop, we hope this chapter created at least some thinking about potential new initiatives and how they might be implemented.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This chapter is the result of the authors' independent research and does not represent the findings, nor necessarily the views, of the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Boulder, CO 80303.

REFERENCES

Allison, Dennis. "Pragmatist Discourse and English for Academic Purposes." *English for Specific Purposes* 15 (1996): 85-103.

American Psychological Association. *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association.* 4th ed. Washington, DC: Author, 1994.

Barks, Debbie and Ana C. Ostermann. "ESP Design for International Graduate Architecture Students." 32nd TESOL Convention. Seattle, USA. March 1998.

Bazerman, Charles. Codifying the Social Scientific Style: The APA Publication Manual as a Behaviorist Rhetoric. In Nelson, Megill, and McCloskey (eds.): 125-44.

_____. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

_____. *Constructing Experience.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994.

Belcher, Diane. "The Apprenticeship Approach to Advanced Academic Literacy: Graduate Students and Their Mentors." *English for Specific Purposes* 13 (1994): 23-34.

_____, and George Braine, eds. *Academic Writing in a Second Language: Essays on Research and Pedagogy.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1995.

Bem, Daryl J. Writing the Empirical Research Article. In *The Compleat Academic: A Practical Guide for the Beginning Social Scientist.* Ed. Mark P. Zanna and John M. Darley. New York: Random House, 1987. 171-201.

Berkenkotter, Carol, and Thomas N. Huckin. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition / Culture / Power.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995.

Bhatia, Vijay. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings.* London: Longman, 1993.

Bloch, Joel, & Lan Chi. "A Comparison of the Use of Citations in Chinese and English Academic Discourse." In Belcher and Braine (eds.): 231-74.

Briggs, Sarah, Victoria Clark, Carolyn Madden, Rebecca Beal, Sunny Hyon, Patricia Aldridge, and John M. Swales. *The International Teaching Assistant: An Annotated Critical Bibliography.* Ann Arbor, MI: English Language Institute Test Publications, 1997.

Carlston, Donal E. Turning Psychology on Itself: The Rhetoric of Psychology and the Psychology of Rhetoric. In Nelson, Megill, and McCloskey (eds.): 145-62.

Casanave, Christine P. Local Interactions: Constructing Contexts for Composing in a Graduate Sociology Program. In Belcher and Braine (eds.): 83-110.

Charney, Davida. "Empiricism is Not a Four-Letter Word." *College Composition and Communication* 47 (1996): 567-93.

Connor, Ulla. *Contrastive Rhetoric.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Day, Robert A. *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper.* 5th ed. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1998.

Freedman, Aviva, and Peter Medway, eds. *Genre and the New Rhetoric.* London: Taylor and Francis, 1994.

Gosden, Hugh. "Discourse Functions of Marked Theme in Scientific Research Articles." *English for Specific Purposes* 11 (1992): 207-24.

_____. "Verbal Reports of Japanese Novices' Research Writing Practices in English." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 5 (1996): 109-27.

Gross, Alan G. *The Rhetoric of Science.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Hartley, James. "Tabling Information." *American Psychologist* (June 1991): 655-56.

Huckin, Thomas N., and Leslie A. Olsen. *Technical Writing and Professional Communication for Nonnative Speakers of English.* 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1991.

Hyland, Ken. "Talking to the Academy: Forms of Hedging in Scientific Research Articles." *Written Communication* 13 (1996): 251-81.

Johns, Ann N. *Text, Role and Context: Developing Academic Literacies.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Johnstone, Barbara. *The Linguistic Individual.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1979.

Mauranen, Anna. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1993.

Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984): 151-67.

Nelson, John S., Allan Megill, & Donald N. McCloskey, eds. *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

Paltridge, Brian. "Analysing Genre: A Relational Perspective." *System* 23 (1995): 503-11.

Pennycook, Alistair. "Vulgar Pragmatism, Critical Pragmatism, and EAP." *English for Specific Purposes* 15 (1997): 85-103.

Potter, Jonathan. *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1996.

Prior, Paul. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistorical Account of Activity in the Academy.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

Rudwick, Martin J. S. *The Great Devonian Controversy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Santos, Terry. "Ideology in Composition: L1 and ESL." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1 (1992): 1-15.

Scollon, Ronald, and Suzanne W. Scollon. *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1995.

Swales, John M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

_____. *Other Floors, Other Voices: A Textography of a Small University Building.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.

_____., and Christine B. Feak. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

_____., Ummul K. Ahmad, Yu-Ying Chang, Daniel Chavez, Dacia F. Dressen, and Ruth Seymour. "Consider This: The Role of Imperatives in Scholarly Writing." *Applied Linguistics* 19 (1998): 97-121.

_____., and Stephanie Lindemann. Teaching the Literature Review to International Graduate Students. In *Pedagogy and Genre.* Ed. Ann Johns. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, in press.

Thompson, George, and Yiyun Ye. "Evaluation in the Reporting Verbs Used in Academic Papers." *Applied Linguistics* 12 (1991): 365-82.