Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2004) **24**, 165–186. Printed in the USA.
Copyright © 2004 Cambridge University Press 0267-1905/04 $12.00
DOI: 10.1017/S026719050400008X

8. TRENDS IN TEACHING ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES

Diane D. Belcher

This review of trends in the teaching of English for specific purposes (ESP) presents recent developments in ESP praxis from three different but not mutually exclusive points of reference: the sociodiscoursal, sociocultural, and sociopolitical. In addition to a selection of exemplar practices, theoretical analogues are considered for each of these three socially oriented perspectives on ESP. For the sociodiscoursal approach to ESP, genre theory and genre-informed pedagogy are highlighted; for the sociocultural, theories of situated learning and their practical corollaries are focused on; for the sociopolitical, theories and applications of critical pedagogy are emphasized. Possible research directions for all three social turns of ESP are also suggested.

New York: An English as a Second Language textbook focuses predominantly on food-preparation vocabulary, night-school student Eduardo Reyes reported Monday. "I must admit, I would like to learn how to say more than, 'I have diced the onions,' and 'Did he want scrambled or over-easy?' "said a disconsolate Reyes, speaking through a translator, following his first lesson. "I had hoped to learn words for the different parts of the body so I can pursue my dream of becoming a doctor. I have instead learned much about the grilling of chickens" (Siegel, 2002, p. 206).

Although the preceding quotation is actually a parody of a report on a New York City adult literacy class taken from the satirical publication *The Onion*, it may capture for many critics of English for specific purposes (hereafter ESP[1]) what they feel is the essence of the shortcomings of the ESP approach to English language teaching: that it teaches learners enough English to survive in certain narrowly defined venues but not enough to thrive in the world at large. A common litany of complaints includes the observation that texts used in ESP pedagogy are too far removed from the real-life contexts that learners aim for (see Adam and Artemeva, 2002, on "textoids," and Auerbach, 2002, on learner vs. language expert goals). Another common complaint is that many ESP instructors could not (or would not) engage in the type of specialized language use that they attempt to induct learners

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

into, e.g., humanities majors teaching the language of science and technology (Spack, 1988; for a recent response to Spack, see Bruce, 2002). Hand in hand with the latter criticism comes the view that ESP has a strong bent toward accommodationism, or "vulgar pragmatism" (Pennycook, 1997), because it seeks to help learners fit into, rather than contest, existing socioeconomic and political structures no matter how inequitable their power distribution may be.

Those familiar with ESP as it is often practiced today, or as many would like to see it practiced, would likely deny that the *Onion* scenario and much of the criticism of ESP's narrow window on the world have much to do with current ESP best practices. Ideally, ESP pedagogy is driven by learner-centeredness (Johns & Price-Machado, 2001; but see also Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, for a critique of ESP's learner focus). In fact, ESP was, arguably, learner-centered long before the term became popular in ELT, as the four-decades-old approach called ESP (see Swales, 2000) is by definition one that attempts to give learners access to the language they want and need to accomplish their own academic or occupational goals. Whether or not ESP is always as sensitive to learners' needs and successful at meeting them as it should be is another matter. Unlike other pedagogical approaches, which may be less specific-needs-based and more theory-driven, ESP pedagogy places heavy demands on its practitioners to collect empirical needs-assessment data, to create or adapt materials to meet the specific needs identified, and to cope with often unfamiliar subject matter and even language use; moreover, they must do all of the above without allowing the aims of a funding agency, an employer, an *au courant* educational theory, or an instructor's own idiosyncratic sense of what's best for language learners to affect attempts to address specific learners' current and future needs.

Perhaps because of its very pragmatism—its eagerness to be responsive to learners' target academic and occupational needs—and its lack of a well-developed, identifiable theoretical base, which Hyland (in press) finds unsurprising given its "pragmatic diversity," ESP appears, at least in its current incarnation, receptive to criticism and input from a number of philosophical and theoretical fronts (Hyland, 2003; Johns, 2002b; Swales, 2000). As a result of this ideological permeability, ESP pedagogy can be viewed at present as developing in three overlapping directions: the sociodiscoursal, sociocultural, and sociopolitical. Although it would be more than unfair to countless ESP practitioners over the past decades to say that they have totally ignored social context (or their social consciences!), it may well be fair to say that never before has ESP emphasized social situatedness as much as it does today. In what follows, I will look at the three aforementioned social turns that ESP has taken, focusing first on their theoretical impetus and then on actual praxis.

The Sociodiscoursal Approach: Situated Genre Analysis

Theory

In many respects, the means and ends of ESP and genre studies are so similar that it is difficult to disentangle the two: both investigate the discourse of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

specific speech communities, with attention to the types of written and oral texts, or "structured communicative events" (Hyland, 2003), used and valued in those contexts. The fact that such influential and productive scholars as Swales (1990), Johns (2002b) and Hyland (in press) straddle both domains no doubt contributes to some of the blurring of boundaries. Many in ESP would argue that genre analysis is a tool of ESP, an engine for discovery and analysis of target text-types (see Paltridge, 2002, on the text-type/genre distinction) and for generation of genre-oriented teaching materials. Others, such as Hyon (1996) and Hyland (2002), have looked at ESP as a subcategory of genre studies, with North American New Rhetoric, a product of postmodernist theory and L1 composition research (see Hyland, in press), and the Australian Sydney School, derived from Systemic-Functional Linguistics (SFL), as the other two branches. Taking ESP as one's major vantage point on genre, however, it is easy to view ESP as having subsumed the other non-ESP genre studies offshoots, or put another way, as having co-opted them, and becoming the richer for having done so (Hyland, 2003).

Both New Rhetoric (NR) and the Sydney School have provided ESP with previously missing perspectives on genre. As recently as the mid-1990s, Prior observed that ESP, or more specifically, EAP (English for academic purposes), ran the risk of treating students as "'academic dopes' endlessly re-encoding the abstract rules and conventions of monologic discourses" (1995, p. 78). New Rhetoricians such as Prior deserve credit for bringing a more nuanced view of meaning and text to ESP by calling attention to the seemingly endless variation, dynamism, and situatedness of genre (but see Russell, 1997, on "reinscribed structuralist views," or "neostructuralism"). Influenced by the work of Bakhtin, (1981), Volosinov, Kristeva, and others, New Rhetoricians such as Adam and Artemeva (2002), Bazerman (2002), and, of course, Prior (1998) offer a perspective on discourse as always utterance, i.e., dialogic, or contributing to dialogue, and characterized by addressivity, or anticipation of response; and by heteroglossia, or multivocality, also known as intertextuality, i.e., filled with the voices (prior texts) of others. Russell remarks of Bakhtinian "dialogism's" contribution to our understanding of discourse that it "allow[s] a more dynamic and interactive or ecological approach," going "further than social constructionism toward solving the problems of the relations among language, the individual and the social" (1997, p. 2).

The Sydney School, which Hyland (2003) points to as the most fully theorized of the three genre branches thanks to its SFL basis, is somewhat analogous to NR, insofar as both see text as context, an essential tenet of neo-Firthian, Hallidayan linguistics, yet the Australians have shown more interest in textual than in situational analysis (as well as more interest than either ESP or NR in the education of very young learners). For the Sydney School, however, like the New Rhetoricians, genre is more than the sum of its macro and micro parts. Discourse is seen through the lens of field (ideational content), tenor (interpersonal context), and mode (textuality). The Sydney School's conceptualization of genre is not so complex, however, as to make it virtually unteachable. While for many New Rhetoricians (e.g., Dias, Freedman, Medway, & Pare, 1999), the ability to "genre" (Adam & Artemeva, 2002) is seen as most often learned through immersion in a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

particular setting;[2] for many in the Sydney School, who view genre knowledge as a source of power in society, explicit genre instruction is, in effect, a moral imperative (Cope & Kalantzis, 1999). Aspects of both stances on the teachability of genre can be found in ESP pedagogy today (e.g., Pang, 2002), as we shall soon see.

New Rhetoric and the Sydney School are not, however, the only influences on ESP's re-envisioning of genre. The relatively new technology-fueled field of corpus linguistics is also further extending our range of view on genre through the collection and analysis of immense computer-compiled corpora of written and oral texts, (e.g., the Collins COBUILD "Bank of English," http://titania.cobuild.collins.co.uk/, retrieved November 20, 2003, which is now at 450 million words and still growing). Corpus linguists are amassing a greater wealth of information on textual variation (Grabe, 2002) for both "authentic" and "classroom" genres (Johns, 1995) than ever before possible (for examples of classroom genres, see the MICASE corpus, http://www.lsa.umich.edu/eli/micase/ATTRIB.html, retrieved November 20, 2003). Hyland's (2000) computer concordance-informed analysis of hedges and boosters in disciplinary texts is but one example among many, in Hyland's own prolific corpus-oriented research and that of others, of how corpus linguistics is expanding the genre knowledge base available to ESP practitioners (see, e.g., Flowerdew, 2003, on professional and learner corpora; Jabbour, 2001, on corpus-derived EAP materials development).

Praxis

The logical next question one might ask following my brief discussion of genre is, How are these theoretical insights and high-tech databanks and analyses reflected in ESP classroom practice? I use the verb "reflected" cautiously in posing this question in order to soften any suggestion of direct causal relationship between recent developments in genre studies and particular ESP pedagogical practices, which would be difficult to demonstrate except in the cases where the materials developers/lesson designers themselves have acknowledged such an influence (or were both genre theorist/researchers and classroom implementers themselves, e.g., Swales). It may be more realistic and accurate to view the theoretical and pedagogical developments as parallel phenomena (but not distantly parallel universes) influenced by ongoing researcher and practitioner conversations about genre. In the following section, I describe recent genre-related practices in both EAP and EOP. These are by no means the only such pedagogical developments of note, but they are particularly salient ones (for additional genre-inspired ESP-related activities/materials see Paltridge, 2001).

English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

Some of the arguments that Swales (1996) has advanced for teaching advanced EAP clearly resonate with those that Sydney School adherents (e.g., Cope & Kalantzis, 1999) have voiced for beginning EAP for Aboriginal and immigrant child and adult learners: namely, that the genres second language (or dialect) learners need to "do" things in society (see Miller, 1984, on genre as social action) may be

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

hidden or seldom or poorly taught. Swales, through his own ESL teaching and textbook writing with Feak (Swales & Feak, 1994, 2000), has sought to provide graduate-level nonnative English-speaking students (NNESs) with access to some of these "occluded" and semi-occluded genres—e.g., conference abstracts, correspondence with editors, and academic job applications—genres often assumed to be tacitly acquired via the normal progression of academic acculturation, or "generic escalation" (Swales & Luebs, 2002, p. 137).

What is especially noteworthy about Swales and his colleagues' approach to teaching such genres is their avoidance of the "cookie-cutter" approach complained of by New Rhetoricians (e.g., Freedman & Adam, 2000). For example, in the literature review "jigsaw" task that Swales uses in his dissertation classes as a sociorhetorical consciousness-raising activity (Swales & Lindemann, 2002), there is no single right answer, no one organizational strategy suitable for all occasions. Instead, students are asked to arrive at their own rhetorically motivated, discipline-informed arrangements of the citation puzzle pieces. Avoidance of simplistic genre formulas is, in fact, evident throughout Swales and Feak's recent sequel to *Academic Writing for Graduate Students* (1994), which was also notable for its nonprescriptiveness and respect for "students-as-ethnographers" (see Johns, 1995). Swales and Feak note that in *English in Today's Research World* (2000) they "go [even] further" than previously in inviting readers to "conduct mini-analyses of the language and discourse of their fields" and are "'up front' about areas of uncertainty, ignorance, or conflicting findings"(p. vi) in the research on academic discourse, in other words, about the limitations of any guidance it can provide. Learner autonomy for those already immersed in their disciplines but perhaps still struggling to stay afloat is clearly one of the goals of the Swales and Feak approach to EAP.

Other EAP specialists are also notable for attempting to steer learners clear of formulaic approaches to academic discourse. Reflecting on his own teaching of the notoriously amorphous genre (or genre set) we know as the "academic essay," Dudley-Evans (2002) observes that it makes little sense, given the huge range of rhetorical options, to attempt to present a "pattern of moves" for the essay. Instead, Dudley-Evans focuses on "issues related to stance or positioning" (p. 235), which is as much of a "genre approach," he argues, as any based on traditional moves analysis. Similarly, Johns (2002a), who often works with at-risk "Generation 1.5" undergraduates, argues for the need to "destabilize" their notions of the "research paper," another highly variable school genre that tempts students to pour content into a familiar five-paragraph essay mold or some other well-rehearsed model template. In Johns's content-based, subject-area-linked EAP classes, students become "genre theorists," reflecting in their writing portfolios on the various stages of their own research writing process—e.g., interviewing, gathering sources, note-taking—and growing in awareness of the complex negotiation of texts and authorial position taking that we call a "research paper."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Academic English for Occupational Purposes (EA/OP)

In EA/OP (academic-for-occupational-purposes English), approaching text as context is an increasingly attainable goal in the classroom as practitioner/researchers discover the advantages of new technologies, e.g., video cameras and networked computers, and resulting access to virtually real-world settings. Technology facilitates not just the recording, collecting, and analyzing of real interactional data but also the generation of teaching materials from those actual occupational situations—doctor/nurse/patient, lawyer/client, businessperson/customer, or air traffic controller/pilot interactions. Traditional presessional needs analyses involving solitary English instructor interpretation of target settings and genres via document analysis, surveys, and interviews—indirect windows on context—are increasingly viewed as inadequate input for a pedagogy seeking to foster facility with genres that "work" in occupational settings.

Video cameras are proving especially invaluable for the study of text in context in EMP (English for medical purposes) curricula. For a course developed for medical students in Hong Kong, Shi, Corcos, and Storey (2001) videotaped ward teaching sessions over the course of three months at two hospitals in order to assess the challenges faced by the students when engaged in the discourse of diagnostic hypothesis making. The tapes not only informed the design of Shi et al.'s EMP course but served as teaching materials, with which the students could hone their critical analysis skills and metalinguistic awareness (see also Eggly, 2002). A still more "virtual" approach to EMP was taken by Muangsamai (2003), who required her premedical students in Thailand to construct Web pages on medical topics utilizing online sources. Forced to make their way through what one student described as an "ocean" of information on the Internet, Muangsamai's students became eager but critical consumers of popular, professional, and pseudoprofessional online health-issue discussions, increasingly aware of scientific, humanitarian, and commercial authorial motivations. Thus, through cyberspace, the students were able to enter into a real world of discourse, albeit both fascinating and disturbing, that traditional print teaching materials might only have offered a pale reflection of.

The Sociocultural Approach: Situated Immersion

Theory

New Rhetoric has done more than help complicate and problematize ESP specialists' perception of text. It has also raised questions, as noted earlier, about the teachability of the "strategic, functional relationship between . . . [form] and rhetorical situation" (Coe, 2002, p. 203), more commonly referred to as "genre." This NR problem posing cuts to the heart of ESP, calling into question the entire ESP agenda. What would ESP be without the ability to teach the speech genres (broadly defined to include written text) of specific discourse communities? Echoing Vygotsky, Leont'ev, and more recent activity theorists (see Russell, 1997), who stress the fundamental roles of situated learning and scaffolding, or "legitimate peripheral participation" (Lave & Wenger, 1991), New Rhetoricians mount strong

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

arguments for the necessity of immersion in the target situation. Most ESP theorists and practitioners, in fact, would not disagree that immersion is helpful, even essential to target discourse expertise—that on-site learning is the enabler, for many learners, of expertise in academic and workplace genres. For learners faced with linguistic and literacy barriers, however, ESP proponents contend that immersion is not enough. Colleagues or faculty may be eager to take such newcomers underwing but may be ill-equipped to provide the scaffolded cognitive apprenticeships the novices may need (Belcher, 1994, 1998). For those at a linguistic disadvantage, ESP specialists argue, as do Sydney School adherents (e.g., Christie, 1998), that much more explicit, guided "immersion" is called for than normally available *in situ*.

Praxis

ESP practitioners have responded to the context challenge in a number of ways, ranging from attempting to provide a refuge for the new community members to immersing themselves in the community in search of suitable support for language learners.

Academic English for Occupational Purposes (EA/OP)

Some ESP instructors are so much in agreement with New Rhetoricians regarding the limitations of outsiders that rather than attempting to replicate target situation activities in their classrooms, they concentrate on capitalizing on their own strengths as language specialists. These instructors' classes become a type of "safe house" (Canagarajah, 1997), where newcomers can feel comfortable enough to practice the language and literacy skills needed for a relatively self-confident transition into their new discourse community. Miller's (2001) course for engineering undergraduates with little faith in their ability to survive at an English-medium Hong Kong university exemplifies this incremental, emotionally supportive approach. Rather than borrowing from engineering texts for his course, Miller takes a more English for general purposes (EGP) approach, mining material from popular engineering periodicals. "By using more accessible topics and materials," Miller notes, "I maintain my own and my students' confidence in my ability as their language teacher to handle the material well." Miller is far from alone in his EGP approach to EAP (see Adam & Artemeva, 2002, on the use of more generic academic topics; and Belcher & Hirvela, 2001, on the use of literature in EAP). One of the goals of approaches such as Miller's is to arm language learners with the compensatory strategies they need—not all of which directly pertain to language—to function more autonomously during their academic immersion. Commenting on such "strategic" competencies, Casanave has remarked of her own work with graduate students, "I should be paying as much attention to helping both first and second language graduate students . . . develop skills for dealing with the wide range of social and political interpersonal relationships that interact with locally situated writing activities as I do to helping them learn the language and style of formal academic papers" (2002, p. 215).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Other EA/OP classes do take a more immersion-like, simulation approach but with much scaffolding for both the instructors and the students. While classes team-taught by ESP and subject-area specialists (Dudley-Evans, 1995) or linked with subject-area classes (Johns, 1995) are nothing new, there are other types of expertise infusion now in evidence in ESP pedagogy. One of these is instruction provided increasingly more often by dual-specialist professionals, such as Susan Reinhart (see Feak & Reinhart, 2002), an attorney and EALP (English for academic legal purposes) specialist; Natasha Artemeva (Artemeva & Logie, 2002), a trained engineer and technical writing teacher/researcher; and ENP (English for nursing purposes) specialist Sally Candlin (Candlin, 2002), who has degrees in both nursing and linguistics. Sometimes, however, the most significant subject-area resources in an ESP class are the class members themselves. One EBP (English for business purposes) program in New York City (Boyd, 2002), deliberately strives for a diverse mix of preprofessional and experienced professional business English learners to provide both a more realistic mixed-expertise environment and a more collaboratively informed one. In ESP classes where neither the instructor nor the students have subject-area expertise, experts can be brought in by proxy. In one ENP class (Hussin, 2002), for instance, nursing students are shown videos of experienced nurses performing and talking their way through tasks. In another EMP program (Eggly, 2002) for international medical residents already immersed in their target situation, interactional expertise is brought in via professional actors hired to play patients and help the residents learn to negotiate a variety of doctor–patient interactions. Clearly such classes as described above are not isomorphic with the actual target context, but in many respects they are reasonably close facsimiles of reality.

Some EA/OP programs have moved closer to target contexts by physically taking their students to various field-related environments. In one EALP program (Feak & Reinhart, 2002), students obtain a first-hand, participant–observer perspective on target-area interactions and discourse by sitting in on University of Michigan Law School classes, attending courtroom proceedings and meeting with the judges, as well as touring prisons and talking with inmates. Similarly, in the New York City business English program referred to above (Boyd, 2002), the EBP classes are not only physically located in Columbia University's School of Business, but the students visit Wall Street to meet with an executive to discuss international business issues. In the EMP class for medical residents mentioned above (Eggly, 2002), the students are taken on a tour of Detroit to see for themselves the neighborhoods where their mainly African American patients live—an experience that appears to help the residents feel more comfortable engaging in the personal-topic conversations essential for doctors and their patients. ESP specialists, such as Eggly (2002), who utilize such "field-trip" strategies report that the activities' impact on learner motivation and progress is far greater than the limited "immersion" would suggest.

English for Occupational Purposes (EOP)

Offering classes on-site, in the workplace settings where language learners are already functioning is a long respected and practiced ESP pedagogical

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

intervention. The advantages of teaching on-site are almost too numerous to cite: Learners and their interlocutors well aware of the learners' needs, teachers able to personally observe situated interactions, and workplace realia readily available for classroom simulations. Those who teach on-site are also very much aware of the disadvantages: learners tired after a day's work, erratic attendance and hence unpredictable class size and difficulty sequencing instruction, and often widely varying proficiency levels. Yet, experienced ESP practitioners have developed numerous coping strategies (see Garcia, 2002) and often argue that no off-site venue would allow them to accomplish as much as they do when teaching in their students' target (and current) settings.

With the help of technology, constructivist/collaborative approaches to teaching/learning, and an expanded notion of the language teacher's role, EOP course designers and instructors are finding a number of new ways to maximize the advantages of teaching on-site. Technology has offered teachers the means to overcome the spatial and temporal bounds of their classes by enabling them to audio- or videotape their students on the job during and after their EOP course for ongoing and follow-up needs assessment (e.g., Eggly's, 2002, account of medical residents periodically videotaped in their interactions with real patients in an outpatient clinic). Gu's (2002) report on efforts to compile a corpus of spoken workplace Chinese suggests what can be done for ESP as well: equipping workers with a digital microphone and minidisk digital voice recorder to tape their workplace talk over the course of a normal workweek. Digitalized recordings, video or audio, of course, can be archived for later computer-assisted analysis and, via audio or video streaming, made accessible to anyone with an Internet connection.

In addition to technological enhancements of EOP endeavors, constructivist/collaborative approaches are being extended beyond more predictable expertise sharing, as with ESP instructors and graduate students, to include factory workers, brewers, home-cleaning-service workers, and others (e.g, Noden, 2002). Rose (2003) has commented recently on the tendency to underestimate the cognitive complexity of the many activities involving literacy, numeracy, use of graphics and spatial thinking in seemingly less-literacy-demanding types of expertise. Many ESP specialists, however, have already arrived at an appreciation of the cognitive demands of such occupations. Orsi and Orsi (2002), for example, describe their reliance on their Argentinian students' knowledge of brewing to continuously inform a course aimed at making the brewers bilingual in "beer talk." EOP instructors have also realized how much more successful at motivating language learning on-site workers can be than the teachers themselves, as Garcia (2002) has noted in her account of EOP classes in Chicago factories.

Perhaps because of their heightened awareness of the array of social, material and affective factors that can motivate and facilitate language learning, and of what language learning can accomplish beyond smoother workplace interactions, some number of on-site EOP specialists now see their role as widening to include more than language teaching. Some of the roles contemporary EOP specialists see themselves playing include builders of self-esteem, facilitators of upward mobility,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

contributors to improved worker–worker and worker–management relations (even serving as catalysts for unionization, as in Garcia, 2002), improved patient care, and improved treatment of immigrant workers (e.g., through assertiveness training for immigrant nursing students in Bosher & Smalkoski, 2002), and even as life-savers (as Storer, 1999, suggests EOP interventions in the Thai bar scene can accomplish by enabling bar workers to negotiate safe sex with foreign customers). EOP specialists have no doubt long been more than language teachers (an ambitious undertaking in and of itself), but perhaps only recently have they begun to publicly articulate their additional roles, and to view the roles not as fortuitous by-products of language teaching but as deliberate simultaneous goals of it.

The Sociopolitical Approach: Overcoming the "Limit-Situation"

Theory

Critical pedagogists would probably applaud the extra-linguistic accomplishments of many on- and off-site ESP practitioners, yet they, as have some leading ESP specialists, might also point out that such consciously broader-context aims and social awareness are rather late in coming to ESP. Swales observed in his farewell as editor of the "flagship" ESP journal, *English for Specific Purposes,* that its articles had been "strikingly unengaged by issues . . . of ideology [and] learners' rights" (1994, p. 201). Of his own and other ESP teacher-researchers' classroom practice, Dudley-Evans has remarked that in their efforts to be responsive to "the immediate problems that students faced at a specific time," they were probably unresponsive to "the opportunity to look critically . . . and to help students develop solutions"(2001, p. xi). Master was among the first in ESP to call for a "critical ESP" that would be more self-reflexive in its role in the global spread of English and its readiness to meet learners' needs as defined by "what the institution or workplace needed of them" (1998, p. 724).

That the field of ESP is looking more often and more self-consciously at the broader implications of its classroom efforts and hearing critical pedagogists' calls for rethinking of ELT's goals is apparent not only in accounts of ESP practice but also in the willingness to bring the voices of critical pedagogy to ESP audiences. Critical pedagogist Benesch's (1999) discussion of "rights analysis" first appeared in *English for Specific Purposes*. Likewise, Pennycook's (1997) argument for "critical" rather than unreflective "vulgar" pragmatism was published by the same journal as well as chosen by its editorial board members as the best article of the year. At first sight, ESP and critical pedagogy would seem to be naturally at odds with each other–the former focused on efficiently and cost-effectively (Johns & Price-Machado, 2001) producing linguistically competent workers and students, and the latter interrogating the established social system's needs and proposing other needs that are not socially reproductive. In other words, critical pedagogy asks *whose* needs are being addressed and *why*. In the minds of a number of critical pedagogists and increasingly more ESP practitioners, however, the aims of these seemingly disparate approaches to ELT can be productively melded.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Critical pedagogy has served as a major port of entry into ESP for a number of critical educational, social, and linguistic theories. Even a short list of those whose theories have informed the work of critical pedagogists, and now through them, ESP, reads like a Who's Who of 20th-century thought: liberatory literacy theorist Freire (1994), whose conceptualizations of "hope" (or struggling against, not accepting, injustices), of "limit-situations" (glossed by Benesch, 2001b, as "personal and social obstacles," p. 164), and of the transmission or "banking" model of education, which Freire has cogently opposed, are now widely known; postmodern philosopher and social critic Foucault (1980), for whom power is "always already there" (p. 141; see also Benesch, 2001a); feminists such as Luke and Gore (1992) and other postmodernists who deconstruct "grand theory" and promote awareness of race, class, and gender; and critical discourse analysts such as Fairclough (1995), who see discourse as never neutral or disinterested. The list could easily continue with Bourdieu, Derrida, Gramsci, and others. Inspired by such thinkers, critical pedagogists argue not that academic and occupational survival be disregarded (see Pennycook, 1997), but that language learners need more than communicative competence and functional literacy: They need voices that will speak for them well enough to make a difference in their own and others' lives. Critical pedagogists have, in fact, adopted many of ESP's techniques, (see Benesch, 2001a, on linked classes) but have, with their raised ideological consciousnesses, retooled them in ways that some ESP practitioners may not recognize but others may already be emulating (see Johns, 1997).

Praxis

Critical pedagogy has entered the EAP classroom by several different means: by critically redefining traditional needs analysis as "rights analysis," moving beyond collaborative learning to collectivist action, and revisioning text as not just situated in a context but the hybrid product of multiple contexts, i.e., as a site for negotiation of personal and social identities, of home and academic or professional values.

Benesch (2001a) challenges EAP practitioners to look beyond the obvious academic literacy demands that often define student "needs" toward the rights of students. By "rights," Benesch means not entitlements but "a framework for understanding and responding to power relations" (2001a, p. 108), or opportunities for participation and resistance, for the education students go to college for. In her subject-area linked EAP classes, Benesch thus sees herself as serving more than students' immediate needs. She does provide support for their efforts to meet institutional literacy expectations, but Benesch also encourages her students to put their developing L2 proficiencies to work in articulating their own academic expectations: their rights to comprehensible lectures, clearly defined assignments, time for class discussion—rights that faculty should be but are not always mindful of. What rights analysis can motivate, Benesch notes of her own teaching, is an EAP instructor's decision to facilitate emotionally supportive collectivist action by, for example, as unrevolutionary but effective an act as suggesting that students sit together for moral support in an intimidating class. Or, rights analysis can lead to a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

decision to intervene more preemptively, for instance, by bringing readings on women's issues, e.g., anorexia, into the linked EAP classroom, as Benesch (2001a) has, to compensate for lopsided gender representation in a subject-area syllabus (see Santos, 2001, for an alternate reading of such pedagogical decision making). Classes such as Benesch's own are clear and compelling examples of how EAP can, as Pennycook (1997) notes, play a "significant role in the pluralisation of our students' future knowledge" and become a "pedagogy of cultural alternatives" (p. 264).

Another right of EAP students that critical pedagogists have championed is that of control over their own textual identities. Canagarajah, as an Anglo-educated Tamil speaker well aware of the challenges of "shuttling between communities and literacies" (Canagarajah, 2001b, p. 23), has eloquently described, as well as exemplified in his own writing, how a hybrid textual persona enriched by more than one culture or academic community can be successfully negotiated (Canagarajah, 2001a, 2002). One such account Canagarajah (2001a) presents is of a Sri Lankan graduate student who managed "to reconcile" her own religious and required academic discourses, "find[ing] space [in her texts] for her own subjectivity," in this case a strong personal commitment to her faith, without neglecting academic requirements for "objectivity" (p. 128). Such success stories as Canagarajah tells do more than argue against a deficit model of learners; they suggest what students can accomplish and EAP could nurture with a view of membership in a marginalized discourse community as "not always a 'problem'" but "a resource for critical expression and creative negotiation" (Canagarajah, 2001a, p. 130).

Inclusion of the community partnership (CP) approach to L2 literacy may well be objected to as too far removed from either EAP or EOP to be considered even distantly related. In some respects, CP does bear little resemblance to ESP. Yet CP's goals are, in many ways, not unlike those of ESP—to prepare learners to succeed in specific discourse communities. And CP's means are often those associated with ESP—providing learners with the specific vocabulary and structures and the enhanced linguistic modalities they want and need to succeed.

The differences, however, between traditional ESP and CP are also striking (see Auerbach, 2002). Rather than assessing the needs or even rights of a particular group of already identified learners, CP advocates may work proactively to identify the learners in need of some intervention, such as unschooled Somali refugee woman reluctant to attend classes or interact in English-speaking environments (Fridland & Dalle, 2002). CP adherents also take a very community-oriented approach to determining a course of action, working hard to solicit community input and build consensus in order to motivate commitment and support for improvement. In their classes, CP instructors strive to sustain motivation among learners by maintaining curricular flexibility, changing a syllabus midstream if new group needs arise, e.g., the need to learn the language of doctor visits (Fridland & Dalle, 2002). Also characteristic of CP are its indirect approaches, such as finding childcare for parents who otherwise could not attend classes (Fridland & Dalle, 2002) or starting a school-community vegetable garden to feed students distracted by hunger (Schofield, 2002). Like Benesch and other critical pedagogists, CP advocates teach the advantages of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

collectivist action, or community approaches to problems. CP classes, for example, might teach learners the question posing skills needed to participate in community meetings, as Huerta-Macías (2002) did with Hispanic immigrants in Texas faced with forced relocation by a housing authority. Or, CP proponents might facilitate intergenerational community action, as Crockatt and Smythe (2002) note of their work in remote Nunavut, Canada, where community construction of a library reading tent promoted Inuit biliteracy through family literacy events. The CP approach is obviously less individualistically oriented than learner-centered approaches usually are. It can certainly be argued (e.g., Huerta-Macías, 2002), however, that in meeting community needs, individual learner needs are met as well through CP, which might also be titled ECSP, or English for community-specific purposes.

Research Directions for ESP Pedagogy

Despite the research efforts—including both action research and more formal published research—of several generations of ESP specialists, probably few in this field, as is the case throughout ELT, are satisfied with the current state of knowledge. Those interested in genre analysis, for example, have called attention to how many genres remain under- or uninvestigated. It seems that we are just beginning to understand part-genres, blended genres, genre sets, and genre systems (Bazerman, 2002; Bhatia, 2002; Swales, 2002). With the advent of computer-mediated communication have come a host of entirely new genres, situated somewhere between oracy and literacy yet also extending beyond those realms in their inclusion of visual and auditory "literacies" as well—via color, sound, graphics, and video (Kress, 1998). Few literate occupations or academic sites, in the developed or developing world, will likely escape the impact of these emerging cybergenres. One of the resulting challenges for ESP researchers will be to find ways to facilitate practitioners' conceptualization and operationalization of a more broadly inclusive multiliteracies approach to fostering and assessing genre competence—a "big tent" approach, to borrow Merrifield's (1998, p. 3) term. Such an approach would encompass a multitude of purposes (as seen from learner, teacher, client, community, and others' vantage points) and the growing variety of communicative practices that can lead to their realization.

For those more interested in context than its texts, there remain many underresearched discourse settings. ESP practitioners who work with learners in areas such as home cleaning or factory work or even nursing (see Bosher & Smalkoski, 2002), which has a longer history as an ESP domain, complain of the paucity of published research and materials. Bhatia (2002) has pointed out that even in other areas that have been studied more in depth, we still know little about the nature of expertise—what makes someone a communicatively competent doctor, lawyer, engineer, or businessperson. Research-based definitions of community-specific expertise could guide and buttress the types of evidence-based arguments for prior or continuing support that ESP practitioners are often expected to make. Ideally, such definitions of expertise would be based on data gathered from *both* top-down and bottom-up perspectives (Merrifield, 1998): not limited to the expectations

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

of managers, administrators, and other powerful policymakers but including the view from the assembly line or the outpatient clinic or even the ESP classroom.

With regard to critical approaches, we appear to be only on the cusp of understanding how to help people accomplish change through language. Martin (2002a) has noted of critical inquiry that more is needed than critique of power: "we need to know how people commune in ways that rework its [power's] circulation . . . personally, locally, nationally, and globally" (p. 187). We can begin the type of inquiry Martin calls for, he suggests, by analyzing the peace and reconciliation discourses of "peoples [such as European and indigenous South Africans] learning to live together in their 'new' worlds" (2002a, p. 187). Traditional ESP practitioners might argue that I have again wandered far afield of the usual SP in ESP, yet others would contend that peace-making and other far-reaching community goals are purposes that can be served well by ESP practices (see Master, 1998). Researchers could help ESP achieve more of a community-oriented outlook by assisting in the development of improved means of promoting dialogue, consensus building, and values clarification among diverse, unequally empowered stakeholders. Perhaps the most salutary outcome of such developments would be, ideally, a view of accountability as more mutual (Merrifield, 1998)—a shared responsibility of teachers, students, employees, and other community members as well as of those in positions of greater power and in control of funding. Speaking more specifically of adult literacy education, Demetrion (2000) has argued for a "more expansive notion of the public good" that would move us beyond the popular "cost-benefit utilitarian model" (which currently drives much ESP program assessment; see, for example, Friedenberg, Kennedy, Lomperis, Martin, & Westerfield, 2003, on the "cost-benefit analysis/return on investment model" of workplace program evaluation). The curricula of numerous ESP practitioners, from Chicago to Soweto, clearly already exemplify an expansive notion of public good, but persuasive means of assessing ESP's present and potential contributions to the advancement of individuals and communities are still at a relatively early stage of development (see Weinstein, 2001, on the limitations of "alternative assessments").

In attempting to characterize all the research goals on my wish list above, I would describe them as aimed at deeper knowledge of texts and contexts, and broader knowledge of more, and more varied, school, workplace, and other community settings. In addition, however, I would characterize the goals as aimed at a multidimensional knowledge (cf. Bhatia, 2002) of where discourses and their communities, as well as the ESP professionals committed to understanding and teaching them, are situated in the world at large.

Notes

1. The term *language(s) for specific purposes* (LSP), is preferred of late by many (see the journal *LSP and Professional Communication*, retrieved November 20, 2003, from: http://www.dsff-lsp.dk/centres/dsff/LSPVol1No12001/, as well as Swales, 2000). The term "LSP" highlights the universality of the "specific" approach to linguistic inquiry and teaching, which is actually used in the study

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

and teaching of the specific varieties and registers of many languages other than English. This article, however, will limit its scope to SP as it relates to English language teaching (ELT), hence ESP. Under the ESP umbrella, I will include both EAP, English for academic purposes, and EOP, English for occupational purposes—a not infrequently problematic distinction, in that the categories often overlap. English classes for medical students, for example, could be considered both EAP and EOP instruction.

2. That not all New Rhetoric proponents question the value of explicit genre instruction is evident in the composition textbooks produced by American New Rhetoricians Charles Bazerman (1995, 1997) and Thomas Huckin (Huckin & Olsen, 1991) (J. Bloch, personal communication, January 2003). There appears to be a Canadian–American divide in New Rhetoric, which may reflect the routine teaching of first-year composition classes in U.S. colleges as opposed to the more specialized, individualized writing-center approach (often affiliated with specific "faculties") more common in Canada. Martin (2002b) too has noted "family differences" and "fuzzy borders" among his colleagues in what is known "across the Pacific" (but not necessarily in Australia) as the "Sydney School" (p. 278).

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benesch, S. (2001a). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

For those interested in how a critical approach to pedagogy can be realized in the EAP classroom, Benesch provides clearly reasoned, well illustrated accounts of her own classroom practice. The author is especially adept at articulating in practitioner-friendly terms her own critical stance and that of the critical theorists who have influenced her. Benesch's book helps readers redefine EAP, especially the subject-area linked EAP class, as much more than a "service" to the rest of the academic community.

Candlin, C. (Ed.). (2002). *Research and practice in professional discourse*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Candlin's edited volume is impressive in the scope of its coverage of what Bhatia refers to (in this same volume) as "professional discourse analysis." The 26 chapters report and reflect on discourse practices in a broad range of areas, including health and social care, business communication, the academy, and the media. Although the methods focused on, such as ethnography, genre analysis, corpus linguistics, and conversational analysis, primarily relate to research rather than to pedagogy,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

ESP practitioners, who are, by necessity and choice, discourse analysts, should find much of interest in this volume.

Hewings, M. (Ed.) (2001). *Academic writing in context: Implications and applications: Papers in honour of Tony Dudley-Evans*. Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham Press.

This collection of 15 original essays is an unusually stimulating and engaging Festschrift, quite appropriate as a tribute to one of the most significant contributors to the popularity and development of ESP over the course of three decades. The chapters cover a wide array of EAP topics, ranging from issues relevant to the socialization of novice academic readers and writers, to the specific rhetorical and linguistic features of genres within and across various disciplines.

Johns, A. (Ed.). (2002). *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Johns has assembled, in this 17-chapter volume, representatives of all three major schools of thought in genre studies: the Sydney School, New Rhetoric, and ESP. The contributors consider what a genre approach can (or cannot) offer classroom practitioners. This volume succeeds as few others have in showcasing the multiplicity of views on genre as a concept and as a facilitator of literacy and language learning.

Orr, T. (Ed.). (2002). *English for specific purposes*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Like other volumes in the TESOL Case Studies Series, this book was written by and for practitioners. Readers should find especially helpful the concise and straightforward accounts of the curricular decision-making processes of each of the ESP contributors. The 12 chapters address classroom-practice issues in both academic and workplace settings, many of which are familiar ESP domains, such as English for legal purposes, for medical purposes, and for business. Much less familiar sites of ESP practice, however, are also represented, including English for shipbuilding, for tourism, and for the horse-racing business.

OTHER REFERENCES

Adam, C., & Artemeva, N. (2002). Writing instruction in English for academic purposes (EAP) classes: Introducing second language learners to the academic community. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 179–196). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Artemeva, N., & Logie, S. (2002). Introducing engineering students to intellectual teamwork: The teaching and practice of peer feedback in the professional communication classroom. *Language and Learning across the Disciplines, 6*(1), 62–85.

Auerbach, E. (2002). Shifting roles, shifting goals: Integrating language, culture, and community. In E. Auerbach (Ed.), *Community partnerships* (pp. 1–12). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bazerman, C. (1995). *The informed writer*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Bazerman, C. (1997). *Involved: Writing for college, writing for your self*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Bazerman, C. (2002). Rhetorical research for reflective practice: A multi-layered narrative. In C. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and practice in professional discourse* (pp. 79–93). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Belcher, D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes, 13,* 23–34.

Belcher, D. (1998). Nonnative writing in a corporate setting. In R. Brown (Ed.), *In-house training in technical communication* (pp. 143–154). Arlington, VA: Society for Technical Communication.

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (2001). Literature and L2 composition: Revisiting the debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 21–39.

Benesch, S. (1999). Rights analysis: Studying power relations in an academic setting. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*, 313–327.

Benesch, S. (2001b). Critical pragmatism: A politics of L2 composition. In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 161–172). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bhatia, V. K. (2002). Professional discourse: Towards a multi-dimensional approach and shared practice. In C. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and practice in professional discourse* (pp. 39–60). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Bosher, S., & Smalkoski, K. (2002). From needs analysis to curriculum development: Designing a course in health-care communication for immigrant students in the USA. *English for Specific Purposes, 21*, 59–80.

Boyd, F. (2002). An ESP program for students of business. In T. Orr (Ed.), *English for specific purposes* (pp. 41–56). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Bruce, N. (2002). Dovetailing language and content: Teaching balanced argument in legal problem answer writing. *English for Specific Purposes, 21*, 321–346.

Canagarajah, S. (1997). Safe houses in the contact zone: Coping strategies of African American students in the academy. *College Composition and Communication, 48*, 173–196.

Canagarajah, S. (2001a). Addressing issues of power and difference in ESL academic writing. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 117–131). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Canagarajah, S. (2001b). The fortunate traveler: Shuttling between communities and literacies by economy class. In D. Belcher & U. Connor (Eds.), *Reflections on multiliterate lives* (pp. 23–37). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Candlin, S. (2002). A triple jeopardy: What can discourse analysts offer health professionals? In C. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and practice in professional discourse* (pp. 293–308). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Casanave, C. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Christie, F. (1998). *Pedagogy and the shaping of consciousness: Linguistic and social processes*. London: Cassell.

Coe, R. (2002). The new rhetoric of genre: Writing political briefs. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 197–207). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Collins-COBUILD. The Bank of English. Retrieved November 20, 2003, from http://titania.cobuild.collins.co.uk/.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (1999). *Multiliteracies and the design of social futures*. London: Routledge.

Crockatt, K., & Smythe, S. (2002). Building culture and community: Family and community literacy partnerships in Canada's North. In E. Auerbach (Ed.), *Community partnerships* (pp. 91–105). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Demetrion, G. (2000). Reflecting on culture wars in adult literacy education: Exploring critical issues in "Contested ground." Retrieved November 6, 2003, from http://www.nald.ca/fulltext/cultrwar/page1.htm.

Dias, P., Freedman, A., Medway, P., & Pare, A. (1999). *Worlds apart: Acting and writing in academic and workplace contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dudley-Evans, T. (1995). Common-core and specific approaches to the teaching of academic writing. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language* (pp. 293–312). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Dudley-Evans, T. (2001). Foreword. In S. Benesch, *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics, and practice* (pp. ix–xiii). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dudley-Evans, T. (2002). The teaching of the academic essay: Is a genre approach possible? In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 225–235). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eggly, S. (2002). An ESP program for international medical graduates in residency. In T. Orr (Ed.), *English for specific purposes* (pp. 105–115). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.

Feak, C., & Reinhart, S. (2002). An ESP program for students of law. In T. Orr (Ed.), *English for specific purposes* (pp. 7–23). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Flowerdew, L. (2003). A combined corpus and systemic-functional analysis of the problem-solution pattern in a student and professional corpus of technical writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*, 489–511.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power and strategies. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (pp. 134–145). New York: Pantheon.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Freedman, A., & Adam, C. (2000). Write where you are: Situating learning to write in university and workplace settings. In P. Dias & A. Pare (Eds.), *Transitions: Writing in academic and workplace settings* (pp. 31–60). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Fridland, G., & Dalle, T. (2002). "Start with what they know, build with what they have:" Survival skills for refugee women. In E. Auerbach (Ed.), *Community partnerships* (pp. 27–39). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Friedenberg, J., Kennedy, D., Lomperis, A., Martin, W., & Westerfield, K. (2003). *Effective practices in workplace language training: Guidelines for providers of workplace English language training services*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Garcia, P. (2002). An ESP program for union members in 25 factories. In T. Orr (Ed.), *English for specific purposes* (pp. 161–173). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Grabe, W. (2002). Narrative and expository macro-genres. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 249–267). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gu, Y. (2002). Towards an understanding of workplace discourse: A pilot study for compiling a spoken Chinese corpus of situated discourse. In C. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and practice in professional discourse* (pp. 137–185). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Huerta-Macías, A. (2002). Getting an even start: Family literacy through participation and collaboration. In E. Auerbach (Ed.), *Community partnerships* (pp. 121–131). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Huckin, T., & Olsen, L. (1991). *Technical writing and professional communication for nonnative speakers of English*, (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hussin, V. (2002). An ESP program for students of nursing. In T. Orr (Ed.), *English for specific purposes* (pp. 25–39). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. London: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. London: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 17–29.

Hyland, K. (in press). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hyon, S. (1996). Genres in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 693–722.

Jabbour, G. (2001). Lexis and grammar in second language reading and writing. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 291–308). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Johns, A. (1995). Teaching classroom and authentic genres: Initiating students into academic cultures and discourses. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language* (pp. 277–292). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

Johns, A. (2002a). Destabilizing and enriching novice students' genre theories. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 237–246). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Johns, A. (2002b). Introduction. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 3–13). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Johns, A., & Price-Machado, D. (2001). English for specific purposes (ESP): Tailoring courses to student needs—and to the outside world. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 43–54). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Kress, G. (1998). Visual and verbal modes of representation in electronically mediated communication: The potentials of new forms of text. In I. Snyder (Ed.), *Page to screen: Taking literacy into the electronic era* (pp. 53–79). London: Routledge.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luke, C., & Gore, J. (1992). *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Martin, J. R. (2002a). Blessed are the peacemakers: Reconciliation and evaluation. In C. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and practice in professional discourse* (pp. 187–227). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Martin, J. R. (2002b). A universe of meaning—How many practices? In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 269–278). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Master, P. (1998). Positive and negative aspects of the dominance of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 716–725.

Merrifield, J. (1998). Contested ground: Performance accountability in adult basic education. NCSALL Briefs—Report #1. Retrieved November 6, 2003, from http://ncsall.gse.harvard.edu/ research/report1.htm.

MICASE (Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English). Retrieved November 20, 2003, from http://www.lsa.umich.edu/eli/micase/ATTRIB.html.

Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70*, 151–167.

Miller, L. (2001). English for engineers in Hong Kong. In J. Murphy & P. Byrd (Eds.), *Understanding the courses we teach* (pp. 236–255). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Muangsamai, P. (2003). EFL learning/writing development in the Internet environment: A case-study from pre-medical students' perspectives. Unpublished dissertation, Ohio State University.

Noden, P. (2002). An ESP program for a home-cleaning service. In T. Orr (Ed.), *English for specific purposes* (pp. 189–204). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Orsi, L., & Orsi, P. (2002). An ESP program for brewers. In T. Orr (Ed.), *English for specific purposes* (pp. 175–188). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Paltridge, B. (2001). *Genre and the language learning classroom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Paltridge, B. (2002). Genre, text type, and the English for academic purposes (EAP) classroom. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 73–90). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pang, T. (2002). Textual analysis and contextual awareness building: A comparison of two approaches to teaching genre. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 145–161). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pennycook, A. (1997). Vulgar pragmatism, critical pragmatism, and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes, 16*, 253–269.

Prior, P. (1995). Redefining the task: An ethnographic examination of writing and response in graduate seminars. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language* (pp. 47–82). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

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

Rose, M. (2003). At last: Words in action: Rethinking workplace literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English, 38*, 125–128.

Russell, D. (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society: An activity theory analysis. *Written Communication, 14*, 504–554.

Santos, T. (2001). The place of politics in second language writing. In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 173–190). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schofield, A. (2002). Wild power: School-community partnerships in a South African school district. In E. Auerbach (Ed.), *Community partnerships* (pp. 159–169). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Shi, L., Corcos, R., & Storey, A. (2001). Using student performance data to develop an English course for clinical training. *English for Specific Purposes, 20*, 267–291.

Siegel, R. (Ed.). (2002). *The onion ad nauseam: Complete news archives, 13.* New York: Three Rivers.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly, 22*, 29–51.

Storer, G. (1999). Working the bars. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*, 367–374.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (1994). From John M. Swales. *English for Specific Purposes, 13*, 200–203.

Swales, J. (1996). Occluded genres in the academy: The case of the submission letter. In E. Ventola & A. Mauranen (Eds.), *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues* (pp. 45–58). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Swales, J. (2000). Languages for specific purposes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20*, 59–76.

Swales, J. (2002). On models in applied discourse analysis. In C. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and practice in professional discourse* (pp. 61–77). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Swales, J., & Feak, C. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Swales, J., & Feak, C. (2000). *English in today's research world: A writing guide*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Swales, J., & Lindemann, S. (2002). Teaching the literature review to international graduate students. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 105–119). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Swales, J., & Luebs, M. (2002). Genre analysis and the advanced second language writer. In E. Barton & G. Stygall (Eds.), *Discourse studies in composition* (pp. 135–154). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Weinstein, G. (2001). Developing adult literacies. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 171–186). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X Published online by Cambridge University Press