

RU

От многообразия подходов к жанру в преподавании английского языка как иностранного до интегрированной кросс-культурной модели жанровой педагогики: теоретический обзор

Аленькина Т. Б.

Аннотация. Цель обзора - определить и синтезировать основные тенденции развития подходов к жанру в англо-американском и мировом педагогическом контексте обучения английскому языку как иностранному, а также представить относительно новую область исследований для российской педагогики и ввести в научный обиход и практику наиболее известные термины и методы. Новизна исследования обусловлена тремя аспектами. Во-первых, представленный в статье жанровый подход заключается в новой модели жанровой педагогики, которая основана на достижениях трех современных перспективных направлений гуманитарной мысли - системной функциональной лингвистики, английского языка для специальных целей, новой риторики. Во-вторых, в статье изложены основные методы представителей этих направлений - учебный цикл (системная функциональная лингвистика), макроструктура текста (английский для специальных целей), колесо риторического планирования (новая риторика). В-третьих, выдвинутая в статье гипотеза об эффективности жанрового подхода позволяет говорить о его возможном внедрении в практику преподавания английского языка для академических и специальных целей и академического письма. Результатом реферативного обзора является модель жанровой педагогики, предложенная ведущими исследователями трех школ. Эта модель выдвигает на первый план профессиональные жанры и профессиональные практики, синтезируя эксплицитный и имплицитный методы преподавания жанров в современном контексте компьютерно-опосредованной коммуникации, которая основана на студентоцентричном подходе и принципе развития автономии студента.

EN

From Genre Approaches in Teaching English as a Second Language to the Integrated Cross-Cultural Model of Genre Pedagogy: A Theoretical Review

Alenkina T. B.

Abstract. The purpose of the review is to define and synthesize major trends of genre approaches development in the Anglo-American and worldwide pedagogical contexts of teaching English as a foreign language as well as present this relatively new field for the Russian pedagogy and focus on its most important concepts and methods. The novelty of the research is threefold. First, the genre approach is manifested in the new model of genre pedagogy that is based on three leading schools - the Sydney School of Genre Pedagogy, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), the New Rhetoric. Second, the review deals with new methods suggested by the proponents of these schools - the curriculum cycle (the Sydney School of Genre Pedagogy), the move-step structure (ESP), the rhetorical planning wheel (the New Rhetoric). Third, the hypothesis of the effectiveness of the genre approach allows us to talk about its possible implementation in the teaching practice of ESP and Academic Writing courses. The result of the review is the model of genre pedagogy suggested by the proponents of the three schools. The model foregrounds professional genres and communicative practices, synthesizing explicit and implicit methods of teaching genres in the modern context of computer-mediated communication that is based on the student-centered approach and the development of the learner autonomy.

Introduction

During the last five decades, the concept of genre has evolved from a term concerned primarily with literature into a multidisciplinary and multiperspective phenomenon within several fields: applied linguistics, rhetoric, composition studies, second-language (L2) pedagogy, writing studies. In the 21st century, genre has entered the foreign language classroom as a pedagogical tool in the writing-to-learn strand with lots of questions still left unanswered. One of such questions is whether genre should be taught explicitly or implicitly for different audiences and different contexts.

In the Russian pedagogical context, genre pedagogy is not as widespread as in the Anglo-American one. The search of the method that leans towards a grammar-translational or a communicative method in our teaching practice does not allow us to understand a full potential of the genre in modern pedagogy. The relevance of genre pedagogy has made Russian language professionals enter the conversation on the concept of genre in the modern international context, as well as find an optimal method in the way of explicit or implicit teaching. The focus of this study is on reviewing the most influential schools of genre dominant in the Anglo-American paradigm. The review is limited by the English-language works published in 1982-2022 on the Sydney School Genre Pedagogy based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), English for Specific Purposes, the North American school known as the New Rhetoric. Although our emphasis is on the pedagogical implications, understanding of the concept of genre in different schools and traditions is of great importance as “implementing genre-based teaching involves an understanding of key principles of genre-based pedagogy and tools for putting these principles into practice” (Tardy, 2019, p. 3).

The objectives of the review are the following:

- to identify historical and cultural conditions of the emerging genre pedagogy in the discourse era and the developing and evolution of SFL;
- to trace the major trends of SFL-related pedagogy in secondary and tertiary educational contexts seen in the interplay of language and content;
- to address the explicit method of move-step structure (J. Swales) at the graduate level of education for L2 students;
- to define the major features of the New Rhetoric genre theory, focusing on the dynamic nature of modern genres in the digital environment and, as a result, the need for implicit method of genre teaching.

The practical significance of the research is in integrating, systematizing, and synthesizing different approaches to genre, methods, and tasks. The theoretical value, as we see it, is in providing theory-based insights into the nature of genre and putting genre studies in the historical, international, and interdisciplinary context, as well as bridging the gap between genre analysis, applied linguistics, writing studies, composition studies, cognition and learning studies, among others.

Our hypothesis is that genre-based methods of teaching English for academic and specific purposes and academic writing have a hidden potential that is still underestimated. The author hopes that the review will help Russian educational linguists and language professionals see the potential of genre-based pedagogy in order to adapt and implement its methods of explicit or implicit genre teaching in various Russian contexts, thus keeping the dialogue toward a more complex and culturally relevant pedagogy.

The remaining part of the article is organized as follows. Section 1 describes the social turn in humanitarian thinking with the predominance of Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis. Section 2 deals with the SFL-related Sydney School Genre Theory with its textual product emphasis in the secondary school settings and its application for graduate students' purposes, as well as the critique of this methodology. The tertiary educational L2 contexts aimed at professional genres is the focus of the English for Specific Purposes school (Section 3). The method of explicit genre teaching is opposed by the North American school known as the New Rhetoric (Section 4). This research-based school analyzes genre as a culturally and historically predetermined phenomenon that foregrounds a rhetorical dimension and implicit teaching methods. The Conclusion opens up new venues for genre-based pedagogy in Russia that can choose a method or integrate all the suggested methods in the eclecticism of the genre pedagogy model.

Results and Discussion

1. The Discourse Era as a Conceptual Background for Emerging Genre Pedagogy

In the 1970s, discourse became a key concept both in the field of sociology, political sciences, as well as gradually was getting to be a central concept in applied linguistics and L2 teaching. Using the most general definition, discourse is one of the basic concepts of modern humanitarian knowledge. There are plenty of more specialized definitions of discourse, though. Thus, J. Blommaert (2005) describes the function of discourse as “comprising all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural and historical patterns and developments in use” (p. 3).

The semiotic activity is realized in discourse analysis – an interdisciplinary analysis that “looks at patterns of language across texts as well as social and cultural context in which they occur” (Paltridge, 2007, p. 1). The strategies of discourse analysis range from more text-oriented views, which concentrate on language features of the text, to more socially-oriented views of discourse analysis.

Unlike discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis includes not only a description and interpretation of discourse in context, but also offers an explanation “why and how discourses work” (Rogers, 2004a, p. 2). Thus, critical

discourse analysis migrates between the written text and the sociocultural context of its production and interpretation. Norman Fairclough (1992) contemplates: “Discourse is, for me, more than just language use: it is language use, whether speech or writing, seen as a type of social practice” (p. 28). J. P. Gee (1996) makes a distinction between “little d” and “D” discourse. “Little d” refers to language bits or the grammar of what is said, while Discourses are much more than the language. They are “ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing that are accepted by specific groups of people” (p. VIII).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) seen through the educational lens is an attempt to describe, interpret, and explain the relationship between form and function. The form of language consists of grammar, morphology, semantics, syntax, and pragmatics. The function of language includes how people use language in different situations to achieve an outcome. The form-function relationships viewed in the perspective of power is a subject of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), a “linguistic backbone of CDA” (Rogers, 2004b).

Educational linguistics, spinning off from the theory of SFL, has contributed widely with the theoretical and pedagogical tools for the teaching of languages, genres, and multimodal literacy pedagogy (Gibbons, 2015; Harman, 2017).

However, the form-function dilemma is pursued in all schools of genre that evolved in the discourse era.

2. Systemic Functional Linguistics and Its Pedagogical Implications

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), also known as the Sydney School, argues that there is a relationship between lexicogrammar and discourse that emphasizes a close interaction of function and system.

Keeping in mind the language as system approach, critical applied linguists see the text tightly connected with context, and namely the context of culture (“genre”) and the context of situation (“register”). The cultural nature of genre is highlighted in the definition of genre as “the system of staged goal-oriented social processes through which social subjects in a given culture live their lives” (Martin, 1997, p. 13). Genres are “realized through register” (Martin, 1992, p. 505) that comprises the “field” (subject matter), “tenor” (who is involved), “mode” (what channel of communication is involved). SFL register and genre analysis builds bridges between features of texts and contexts of use, thus constructing special meanings of those texts in the contexts of situation and of culture. In the second edition of their seminal work (Biber, Conrad, 2019), renowned linguists added a new chapter on ESP and EAP (English for Academic Purposes), thus maintaining an inner connection of applied linguistics and genre pedagogy.

Pedagogically, SFL-based approach has provided an impetus to foregrounding of genre in the so-called Sydney School Genre Pedagogy. The proponents of the School described the importance of genre-related pedagogy that allows one to capture advanced language proficiency (Rose, Martin, 2012; Ryshina-Pankova, 2018).

Educational linguists argued for a special status of genre in language teaching: “Genre is productive in terms of pedagogic practice; it constitutes a middle ground between the concrete wordings we need to teach our students so they can use language effectively, the contexts that determine the meanings they need or care to make, and the wider culture in which social activities are carried out” (Boccia, Hassan, Moreschi et al., 2019, p. 11).

Taking genres as key pedagogical objects, the proponents of explicit genre teaching viewed genres as textual products. Suggested by the Sydney School proponents, the curriculum cycle method emphasizes the process of teaching and learning and is mainly used at the secondary level of education. The curriculum cycle consists of four stages, each stage having its own particular teaching purpose (Rothery, Stenglin, 1995):

Stage 1: Building the Field, or focusing the attention on the content or information of the source text.

Stage 2: Modeling the Genre, known also as the Deconstruction Stage, or helping students see the purpose, structure, and linguistic features of the text they are going to write.

Stage 3: Joint Construction, or the process of writing a text together with students and considering both the content and language.

Stage 4: Independent Writing, or the stage of independent construction of the student’s own text.

On the one hand, the curriculum cycle provides a shared space for teachers and students, which gives a tool for learning structure and “lexicogrammar” of the certain text genre (Derewianka, Jones, 2010; Nagao, 2019). From this perspective, the curriculum cycle has been the basis for several pedagogical projects in Australia and other parts of the world (Simon, 2005; Gibbons, 2015; Liang, 2015). On the other hand, such a reductive teaching-to-the-test approach denies students a critical analysis of genre where students can analyze, evaluate, and manipulate genres in the context of specific social purposes (Kress, 1994; Frankel, 2013).

Despite critical voices, SFL stays one of the most influential and widely known schools and the curriculum cycle gives an opportunity to guide both undergraduate and graduate students through the process of genre acquisition. For college students, one of the most important goals is the linguistic one – grammar acquisition. According to the modern research on cognitive linguistics, grammar-learning ability changes with age, “is preserved almost to the crux of adulthood (17.4 years old) and then declines steadily” (Hartshorne, Tenenbaum, Pinker, 2018). For graduate students, an effective strategy based on SFL is “mentor texts”. For teachers, mentor texts are the basis for creating classroom tasks that “scaffold students’ understanding of the dialogic nature of academic writing and establish frameworks for students to position their work” (Douglas, 2020, p. 5), focus on structure, content, stylistic elements, and vocabulary. For students, mentor texts are an opportunity to streamline their writing and meet the expectations in the field. Thus, such a “language socialization” (Duff, 2020) opens up a way to autonomous learning and acquiring transferable skills.

Among the linguistic theories, SFL-based concepts serve as tools for textual analysis and content-and-language-integrated exploration of the texts. Within the textual analysis strand, SFL contributed to the development of **task-based research**. An example of it is the genre-based theme-rheme analysis that results in the acquisition of textual cohesion and generic/contextual coherence (Qin, 2022; Gill, Janjua, 2020). This task-based research should encourage an active participation of students who are the makers of the content and the curriculum design in the **data-based teaching** (Loepp, 2019).

Being a part of a student-centered approach, data-based teaching widely implements all the educational technologies. A corpus linguistics method helps to distinguish the lemma and flemma, thus enriching the corpus of Contemporary American English (Webb, 2021).

Globally, SFL-related pedagogies help to promote and achieve multiple literacies and thus reach the ultimate goal of L2 education with its “major shift away from understanding language learning as a solely cognitive process of learning words and linguistics structures and using them to read and write in L2” (Trojan, Herazo, Ryshina-Pankova, 2022, p. 1). Multiple literacies are understood as “the ability to use language as a semiotic resource that enables one to participate in social practice in various contexts of life and helps one achieve the communicative purposes and goals in these contexts” (Trojan, Herazo, Ryshina-Pankova, 2022, p. 2). The plural form of the concept signifies that students can use different languages, in different contexts, and for a variety of purposes; they also use different types of semiotic resources (e.g., verbal and non-verbal) and modes (e.g., oral and written) provided by multimodal texts. SFL-based method of curriculum cycle helps teachers develop multiple literacies: “Through collective negotiation of meaning, argumentation and citation of evidence to defend their interpretations students develop a more robust analysis of multimodal texts” (Lim, 2018). In the process of inductive learning, the students are guided in analyzing the multimodal texts and then applying their critical knowledge in this transformed practice. This practice can be “transforming a magazine into a video” (Lo, Tien, Lee, 2020), a teaching experience of the colleagues from Taiwan.

Another trend that SFL school emphasizes is “the perfect match for content and language integrated learning” (Llinaries, McCabe, 2020). However, the problem remains: how much “content” and how much “language” should be taught for the best result? One more problem is in teaching writing in the content-area instruction and namely the lack of incentive and wish of content instructors to do it (Lampi, Reynolds, 2018).

The effectiveness of narrow-angled versus wide-angled interventions is also a matter of debate. According to Jan Zalewski (2020), a “discipline-specific genre-based tradition” better suits the modern EAP tradition with the need to “teach more transferable knowledge about language, genre, and disciplinary variation” (p. 138). The interplay of content and language is addressed in the articles by A. Cheng (2018), Y. Y. Lo and H. Jeong (2018); what is more, content-area instruction that emphasizes the use of genre pedagogy representing a content-based writing-focused instructional approach is the focus of the article by B. Kindenberg (2021). The authors have come to the conclusion of the effectiveness of genre pedagogy that implements a deeper engagement with the content area.

An important debate is whether English should be the only language of disciplinary instruction. As SFL “works to support linguistically and culturally sustaining pedagogies” (McCabe, 2022, p. 5), cross-linguistic influence has become a separate field of research (McManus, 2022). Understanding the ways in which first language can influence second language learning is a major topic of research and error analysis today (Nava, Pedrazzini, 2018).

All in all, SFL has become one of the most influential theories for genre analysis and the source of genre-based pedagogy. Genre plays a central role in language teaching, serving mainly as a textual product. The leading method called the curriculum cycle is a situated practice that provides an opportunity for students to master lexicogrammar and the macrostructure of the most important text genres. Considering grammar acquisition as the key objective, the curriculum cycle method is widely implemented in secondary schools. For graduate students, the method is transformed into the effective strategy called “mentor texts”, used for scaffolding the students’ understanding of the complex nature of text genres in real-life professional settings.

Emphasizing a close relationship of form and function, the methods range from the text-based to the content-and-language integrated ones. Data-based teaching founded on task-based research supports multiliteracies as the main goal of L2 education. Content-and-language integrated learning balances between content and language, wide-angled and narrow-angled interventions, English as the only language of disciplinary instruction and cross-linguistic teaching.

3. English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and Explicit Method of Genre Teaching for L2 Students: Moves and Steps

One more explicit model of genre teaching catering to the needs of graduate students was proposed by the leaders of the ESP school.

Judging by its name, English for Specific Purposes takes a narrower approach to genre, adapting it to the classroom needs of the professional discourse of the tertiary level of education. The term “genre” first came into the field of ESP in the 1980s. It was the time when the guru of the ESP John Swales strongly supported the value of genre in the L2 context, moving from a focus on lexico-grammatical features to a focus on rhetorical context.

According to J. Swales (1998), genres are “recurrent classes of communicative events that orchestrate verbal life” (p. 20). J. Swales claims that each genre has its own communicative purpose in an academic community. Such genres are introductions to research articles, abstracts, grant proposals that are popular and valued by students in the process of “inventing the university” (Bartholomae, 1986, p. 4). We claim that students are not only inventing the university; they invent their discipline by a staged process of genre construction.

J. Swales (1990) offered an approach to the teaching of academic and research English that “develops and makes use of three key concepts: discourse community, genre and language-learning task” (p. 1). These tasks promote acquisition of genre skills by engaging the students with processing texts. In order to do that, teachers need to describe the structural patterns (or “schemata”) of academic texts. In J. Swales’ (2004) model, each section of the research article genre consists of moves and steps. Moves are “discoursal or rhetorical unit(s) that perform(s) a coherent communicative function in a written or spoken discourse” (p. 228). The moves can vary in length (a clause, a sentence, or a paragraph) and can recur in a cyclical fashion within a section of a text. Steps are elements in a move.

One of the well-known genre models is J. Swales’ description of research article introductions where writers “create a research space” (CaRS) to make their work effective. An effective introduction of the research article is divided into three moves that are divided into several steps. Move 1: Establishing a Territory. Move 2: Establishing a Niche. Move 3: Occupying the Niche, or stating your major objectives. Move 1 consists of three steps: claiming centrality, and/or making topic generalization(s), and reviewing items of previous research. (Swales, 1990; Swales, Feak, 2000; 2012).

Schematic or generic structure co-exists with lexico-grammatical features that correlate with the genre-defining functional elements. According to Jennifer Douglas, the textbook for graduate students (Swales, Feak, 2012) presents “a welcome blend of global and sentence-level strategies” (Douglas, 2020, p. 75).

J. Swales’ model has proved to be highly influential across countries, disciplines, and audiences. The international team of researchers studied the matters of style and language in student research paper introductions: using the method of corpus linguistics, they found the most condensed syntactical complexity of Step 1.1 (“claiming centrality”) and Step 1.3 (“reviewing items of previous research”) (Saricaoglu, Bilki, Plakans, 2021). An explicit move-step method of genre teaching at graduate-level research writing is advocated by Chinese language professionals (Li, Ma, Zhao et al., 2020).

ESP has found its proponents working in the L2 academic contexts all over the world, as it provides a practical approach that was a foundation for multiple textbooks and writing guides that are well known to all language practitioners (Penrose, Katz, 2020; Hyland, 2002; Specialized English..., 2019; Cheng, 2018; Fang, 2021).

Without detracting from the merits of the seminal works based on the move-step structure, voices are raised about the revision of it. One of such voices belongs to T. G. Pollock (2021) and the “five-act structure of drama, with characters, theme and storylines” (p. 5). T. G. Pollock uses Freytag’s Pyramid (1865) while applying exposition, rising action, climax, falling action, and denouement to the quantitative, qualitative, and theory article structure.

Summing up, ESP managed to equip modern teachers, especially those who work with graduate students, with the necessary move-step explicit model of genre teaching that emphasizes both higher-order rhetorical concerns and sentence-level skills. The integration of the core concepts – discourse community, genre, language learning task – builds up the necessary knowledge of the schemata of the academic and professional text genres along with foregrounding the language features of their microstructure for L2 students. Providing scaffolding in the process of writing helps students realize the rhetorical consciousness of different text genres, which turns out to be extremely beneficial for novice writers.

4. The Dynamic Genre in the New Rhetoric School: Implicit Method of Genre Teaching

The rhetorical tradition is theoretically justified in the Rhetorical Genre Studies approach (Bawarshi, Reiff, 2010; Artemeva, 2004), also known as the New Rhetoric (Hyon, 1996; Genre in the Classroom..., 2002). The New Rhetoric was “new”, as it was opposed to the past tradition of purely literary rhetoric and instead explored the means of creating “presence” throughout the techniques of presentation.

Genre as a social action was reconceptualized by Carolyn Miller (1984). Her work marked a beginning of the avalanche of genre research. First, genre has lost its subservient status; “Genres are not just forms. Genres are forms of life, ways of being. They are frames for social action” (Bazerman, 1997, p. 19). Second, genres are alive, and can change, evolve, decay. Third, genre function “constitutes all discourses’ and all writers’ modes of existence, circulation, and functioning within a society, whether the writer is W. Shakespeare or a social worker or whether the text is a sonnet or an assessment report” (Bawarshi, 2003, p. 22).

A dynamic nature of a genre was described by Ann Devitt (2000): “Genres are never stabilized. If each text always participates in multiple genres, even in that text a genre is moving, shifting, and becoming destabilized. Even temporary stability is an illusion of genre theory rather than a reality of genre-in-action” (p. 713).

This dynamic model of a genre is based on the Bakhtinian theory of dialogicity; it is reflected in a concept of genre uptake suggested by Anne Freedman (2020). Uptake is a “responsive chain”; “the dynamics of uptake is that whereby we take a place, or make one, or open the space of questions and interpretation” (p. 118-119). A fluid, dynamic nature of a genre is expanded by S. Auken (2021) and his interpretation of the concept of “embedded genre”, “a genre that is included within the framework of another genre” (p. 164). In his system of genres, “complex genres are built from simpler or “element genres”” (p. 166). For example, “the IMRaD article is formally comprised of four element genres: Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion” (p. 166). S. Auken gives the classification of embedded genres: a recontextualized embedded genre is not an independent genre, “but is rather an uptake on the same genre” (p. 170). An example of such a genre could be the letter in the novel. In contrast, contextualized embedded genres and element genres are the genres themselves.

Such an approach allowed researchers to think of the writer and the audience and move beyond thematic, stylistic, and compositional features of the text genre. The very definition of the concept “genre” gives culturally based features to this complex phenomenon: genres are “the historically specific conventions and ideals according to which authors compose discourse and audiences receive it” (Hanks, 1987, p. 670).

Within the rhetorical framework, research is conducted on the historical evolution of genres (Atkinson, 1999), the processes of revising and responding to reviewers in writing articles (Berkenhotter, Huckin, 1995), and the social impact of transferring genres into new contexts with different purposes (Freedman, Adam, 2000).

A historical perspective is combined with the synchronous approach to genre theory. A number of scholars focus on the major trends of traditional print genres and emerging new genres in the Internet era. John Logie (2022) describes the collaborative nature of writing in the Interneted writing spaces. The remediation of print research articles contributed to the changing genre-based practice of non-linearity of reading with the presence of hyperlinks as well as increasing multimodality of text genres (Li, Ma, Zhao et al., 2020; Luzon, Perez-Llantada, 2022) and the emergence of new research genres, such as registered reports (Mehlenbacher, 2019), and promotion-related genres, such as science-focused crowdfunding proposals (Perez-Llantada, 2020), cover letters (Phan, Socciarelo, 2020), and especially grant proposals (Tohalino, Quispe, Amancio, 2021; Windsor, Kronsted, 2022). According to L. C. Windsor and C. Kronsted (2022), grant writing has been a key genre and at the same time the “hidden curriculum”, where “grant-writing skills often are taught informally with a principal investigator” (p. 313).

Logically, a changing paradigm of Genre Analysis caused a search of a new, more effective method of teaching genres in a new environment. The New Rhetoric leaders criticized SFL and ESP approaches for abstracting genres from their complex, dynamic continuum (Genre and the New Rhetoric, 1994) and for limiting the understanding of genres to features that writers already recognize (Bazerman, 1997). Genres are said to be too unstable and the classroom context – too artificial to teach genre forms explicitly, and instead students should be given an opportunity to observe genres in their actual situation of use (Trosborg, 2000). Writing classes that link observation and interviews with analysis of genres give students access to authentic context for language use. In other words, emphasis is given to raising students’ awareness of contextual features of genres.

Knowledge of the social contexts gives life to texts, and this is more important than the textual formal patterns. The inner dialogicity of the text genres and intertextuality caused interest to secondary research genres, such as a book review. “Learning «scholarship by conversation»” (Rowland, Knapp, Fargo, 2019) recreates the social context of a real-life scientific communication, while the writer identity, stance and voice have been the focus of attention in L2 educational settings (Hisiao, 2019).

A growing interest to the writer identity goes hand in hand with learning sciences and ecological sciences. “Writing researchers now largely turn to ecological models of the writing process, studying the writer in situ. This interest in ecologies of writing reflects larger trends in how we understand the brain, the ever-vexing organ that drives who and what we are – as writers and as people” (Rifenburg, Portanova, Roen, 2021, p. 5). Bringing learning research into educational practice is aimed at addressing social and emotional components of learning, motivation, climate, and presence (Norman, Lotrecchiano, 2021).

It is true that teachers should find a balance between the curriculum cycle (SFL) and move-step structure (ESP) while teaching classroom genres in the academic settings (explicit genre pedagogy) or real-life dynamic genres in the professional settings (implicit genre pedagogy). An attempt to do that has been made in the rhetorical planning wheel suggested by N. A. Caplan and A. M. Jones (2022). The wheel seems to consider all the rhetorical and social factors of the genre realization: purpose, writer’s role or persona, audience, context, structure, language, sources/evidence/data, conventions.

The genre, according to scholars, is a tool, not a container. From this perspective, the purpose is to teach “actions” common to the texts of academic/scientific register. All in all, there are seven actions that need to be taught: summarize, synthesize, explain, report and interpret, argue, respond, analyze. For each action, grammatical and lexical features are addressed. Tasks and texts given for deconstruction and production of the text genres are divided into two major categories: pedagogical and “in the world” ones.

One of the possible tasks of applying the rhetorical planning wheel is “regenreing” suggested by Fiona English (2011): “...turning a text which has been produced using one «big» genre (a student essay) into a different genre (not a student genre)” (p. 27). Such genres could be a newspaper report, a play, or a simulated radio phone-in. Such a manipulation of genres (or “playfulness” according to R. Negretti and L. McGrath (2020)) implies “intentional and metacognitive adaptation of authorial choices in response to different audiences and specific rhetorical goals and personal preferences” (Negretti, McGrath, 2020). Genre manipulation helps students go beyond “apprenticeship-based learning experiences” (Negretti, McGrath, 2020) and allows students to “write differently” in contrast to “shadow writing” (English, 2011).

“Writing differently” is closely related to metacognition that is, first, “our knowledge of concepts, ourselves, the task at hand and strategies we are using (metacognitive knowledge)” and, second, “planning and setting goals, monitoring and evaluating our performance and learning” (Negretti, McGrath, 2018).

Metacognitive skills should be taught as a part of teacher’s development (Tardy, Buck, Pawlowski et al., 2018; Tardy, 2019; Li, Ma, Zhao et al., 2020), which is also one more area of the New Rhetoric research.

While advocating the New Rhetoric approach, modern scholars distinguish genre acquisition from genre awareness. “In the case of genre acquisition, students learn the linguistic and rhetorical patterns of a genre and then aim to replicate those patterns in their own writing. In teaching genre awareness, the aim is for students to gain a sensitivity to intertwined influences of context and form”, thus making it a more transferable skill (Tardy, Buck, Pawlowski et al., 2018).

A modern paradigm of student-centered learning is aimed at fostering learner autonomy. Thus, genre awareness is the main goal in designing technology-mediated task-based language learning (Chong, Reinders, 2020) as well as the New Rhetoric.

The New Rhetoric school of genre that sees genre as a social action has been explored in many theory-based studies. Like in ESP, the New Rhetoric focuses on the professional genres within the framework of computer-mediated communication. Genres are said to be fluid, they live their own life and can be “embedded”. Such a dynamic nature of genres is developed in the Internet era with its changing landscape of traditional print genres and the emergence of the new ones. In this digital environment, it is not possible to teach genres explicitly, but rather to give students a tool and teach “actions” that will help them master real-life dynamic genres.

This implicit genre teaching leaves an opportunity for genre manipulation – regenerating or playfulness. Such tasks foster the student autonomy, providing them a transferable skill that is going to be helpful in real-life professional contexts.

Conclusion

Towards the Integrated Model of Genre Pedagogy

The article is aimed at giving an overview of the major approaches and schools of genre analysis and genre pedagogy in the historical and modern state of development. Historically, genre analysis and genre pedagogy tended to focus mainly on the textual product. However, the Internet era has shifted an emphasis of genre scholars and educational linguists on the professional genres moving between digitality and multimodality, thus on the social practices, “socio-cultural space” and “socio-pragmatic space” (Bhatia, 2017, p. 62). Different approaches to genre that appeared in the discourse era evolved in the digital era, presenting a transformation into the synthesized model of genre pedagogy.

Each of the schools and approaches reviewed has its own purpose and target audience as well as specific teaching methods; each of them contributes to the integrated genre theory that balances between “textways” and “lifeways” (K. Hyland), form and content, microstructure and macrostructure of the text genre, its argumentation, production, and interpretation. While the Sydney School of Genre Pedagogy emphasizes the textual product, providing an insight into the effective method of working with classroom genres at the secondary educational level, the ESP school assists graduate students, mainly L2 learners, to master professional genres. Both schools advocate explicit teaching of genres in different contexts. In contrast, proponents of the New Rhetoric school strive for implicit methods of teaching, claiming the “fluid” nature of each text genre and focusing on its rhetorical dimension.

These approaches are not separated; they are integrated in the student-centered, data-driven, task-based model of pedagogy that aims to develop multiliteracies and rhetorical awareness. In the eclectic, “post” era, in which we are living, text-based and practice-based approaches to genre coexist with the process-based ones. According to R. Badger and G. White (2000), teachers may synthesize the product (or text-based), process, and genre approaches in the so-called “process genre approach”.

In text-based approaches, an emphasis is on lexicogrammar and theme-rheme structure, while using the curriculum cycle and mentor texts (SFL) or a move-step structure (ESP). Practice-based approaches focus on the social and discursive processes through which disciplines constitute themselves (rhetorical planning wheel of the New Rhetoric school). The content-and-language integrated courses implement such a practice-based approach.

Another approach to genre is the process one. Despite the social turn that fosters collaborative nature of writing, the writer identity research, cognition, metacognition, and learning sciences are still important. Metacognition is related to the Genre Theory and its concepts as well as educating teachers as knowledge holders.

The research on the effectiveness of genre pedagogy and the integration of approaches, methods, and tasks is going on.

Источники | References

1. Artemeva N. Key Concepts in Rhetorical Genre Studies: An Overview // Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing. 2004. Vol. 20 (1).
2. Atkinson D. Scientific Discourse in Sociohistorical Context: The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 1675-1975. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 1999.
3. Auken S. Genres inside Genres: A Short Theory of Embedded Genre // Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Redactologie. 2021. Vol. 31.
4. Badger R., White G. A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing // ELT Journal. 2000. Vol. 54 (2).
5. Bartholomae D. Inventing the University // Journal of Basic Research. 1986. Vol. 5. No. 1.
6. Bawarshi A. S. Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition. Logan: Utah State University, 2003.
7. Bawarshi A. S., Reiff M. J. Genre: An Introduction to History, Theory, Research, and Pedagogy. West Lafayette: Parlor Press, 2010.
8. Bazerman C. The Life of Genre, the Life in the Classroom // Genre and Writing: Issues, Arguments, Alternatives / ed. by W. Bishop, H. Ostrom. Boynton - Cook: Heinemann, 1997.
9. Berkenhotter C., Huckin Th. Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995.
10. Bhatia V. K. Critical Genre Analysis: Investigating Interdiscursive Performance in Professional Practice. L.: Routledge, 2017.

11. Biber D., Conrad S. Register, Genre, and Style. 2nd ed. Cambridge - N. Y.: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
12. Blommaert J. Discourse. A Critical Introduction. Key Topics in Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
13. Boccia C., Hassan S., Moreschi E., Salmaso G., Farias A., Day M. R. Teaching and Learning EFL through Genres. Mendoza, 2019.
14. Caplan N. A., Johns A. M. Essential Actions in Academic Writing: A Genre-Based Approach. Michigan: Michigan Press ELT, 2022.
15. Cheng A. Genre and Graduate-Level Research Writing. Ann Arbor: Michigan ELT; Michigan University Press, 2018.
16. Chong S. W., Reinders H. Technology-Mediated Task-Based Language Teaching: A Qualitative Research Synthesis // *Language Teaching and Technology*. 2020. Vol. 24 (3).
17. Derewianka B., Jones P. From Traditional Grammar to Functional Grammar: Bridging the Divide // *NALDIC Quarterly*. 2010. Special Issue. Language Support in EAL Contexts: Why Systemic Functional Linguistics?
18. Devitt A. J. Integrating Rhetorical and Literary Theories of Genre // *College English*. 2000. Vol. 62 (6).
19. Douglas J. Developing an English for Academic Purposes Course for L2 Graduate Students in the Sciences // *Graduate Writing across the Disciplines: Identifying, Teaching, and Supporting* / ed. by M. Brooks-Gillies. Louisville: University of Colorado Press, 2020.
20. Duff P. A. Language Socialization in Classrooms: Findings, Issues, and Possibilities // *Language Socialization in Classrooms. Culture, Interaction, and Language Development* / ed. by M. J. Burdelski, K. M. Howard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
21. English F. Student Writing and Genre Reconfiguring. L.: Academic Knowledge Continuum, 2011.
22. Fairclough N. Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.
23. Fang Z. Linguistic Features of Academic Writing // Fang Z. *Demystifying Academic Writing: Genres, Moves, Skills, and Strategies*. N. Y.: Routledge, 2021.
24. Frankel K. Revisiting the Role of Explicit Genre Instruction in the Classroom // *The Journal of Education*. 2013. Vol. 193. No. 1.
25. Freedman A. A Tardy Uptake // *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Redactologie*. 2020. Vol. 30.
26. Freedman A., Adam C. Write Where You Are: Situating Learning to Write in University and Workplace Settings // *Transitions: Writing in Academic and Workplace Settings* / ed. by P. Dias, A. Pare. Cresskill: Hampton Press, 2000.
27. Gee J. P. Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses. Critical Perspectives on Literacy and Education. 2nd ed. L. - N. Y.: Taylor & Francis, 1996.
28. Genre and the New Rhetoric / ed. by A. Freedman, P. Medway. L.: Taylor & Francis, 1994.
29. Genre in the Classroom: Multiple Perspectives / ed. by A. M. Johns. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002.
30. Gibbons P. Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning. Teaching English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom. 2nd ed. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2015.
31. Gill A. A., Janjua F. Genre Pedagogy and ELL Writing Skills: A Theme Analysis // *English Language Teaching*. 2020. Vol. 13. Iss. 8.
32. Hanks W. F. Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice // *American Ethnologist*. 1987. Vol. 14 (4).
33. Harman R. Bringing It All Together: Critical Take(s) on SFL // *Bilingual Learners and Social Equity* / ed. by R. Harman. Cham: Springer, 2017.
34. Hartshorne J. K., Tenenbaum J. B., Pinker S. Critical Period for Second Language Acquisition: Evidence from 2/3 Million English Speakers // *Cognition*. 2018. Vol. 177. URL: https://stevenpinker.com/files/pinker/files/hartshorne_tenenbaum_pinker_a_critical_period_for_second_language_acquisition.pdf
35. Hisiao C. Attitudes: Authorial Stance in the Review Genre of Taiwanese MA Graduates // *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*. 2019. Vol. 7 (2).
36. Hyland K. Teaching and Researching Writing. Applied Linguistics in Action. Harlow: Pearson, 2002.
37. Hyon S. Genres in Three Traditions: Implications for ESL // *TESOL Quarterly*. 1996. Vol. 30.
38. Kindenberg B. Fixed and Flexible, Correct and Wise: A Case of Genre-Based Content-Area Writing // *Linguistics and Education*. 2021. Vol. 64. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0898589821000371?via%3Dihub>
39. Kress G. R. Learning to Write. 2nd ed. L. - N. Y.: Routledge, 1994.
40. Lampi J. P., Reynolds T. Connecting Practice and Research: From Tacit to Explicit Disciplinary Writing Instruction // *Journal of Developmental Education*. 2018. Vol. 41. No. 2.
41. Li Y., Ma X., Zhao J., Hu J. Graduate-Level Research Writing Instruction: Two Chinese EAP Teachers' Localized ESP Genre-Based Pedagogy // *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 2020. Vol. 43. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100813
42. Liang E. Implementing Genre-Based Curriculum Cycle in Teaching Writing in Secondary School Settings // *Studies in Literature and Language*. 2015. Vol. 10. No. 1.
43. Lim F. V. Developing a Systemic Functional Approach to Teach Multimodal Literacy // *Functional Linguistics*. 2018. Vol. 5 (13). URL: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40554-018-0066-8>
44. Llinaries A., McCabe A. Systemic Functional Linguistics: The Perfect Match for Content and Language Integrated Learning // *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 2020. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13670050.2019.1635985>
45. Lo Y. Y., Jeong H. Impact of Genre-Based Pedagogy on Students' Academic Literacy Development in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) // *Linguistics and Education*. 2018. Vol. 47.
46. Lo Y.-H. G., Tien W.-C. F., Lee S.-Y. Transforming a Magazine into a Video Involving a Target Audience: A Multi-literacies Case Study in an EFL Context // *Educational Technology and Society*. 2020. Vol. 23. No. 3.

47. Loepp E. Data-Based Teaching: An Instruction and Call for Collaboration // PS: Political Science and Politics. 2019. Vol. 52. Iss. 4.
48. Logie J. Writing in the Clouds: Inventing and Composing in Internetworked Writing Spaces. Anderson: Parlor Press, 2022.
49. Luzon M. J., Perez-Llantada C. Digital Genres in Academic Knowledge Production and Communication: Perspectives and Practices. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2022.
50. Martin J. R. Analysing Genre: Functional Parameters // Genres and Institutions: Social Processes in the Workplace and School / ed. by F. Christie, J. R. Martin. L.: Continuum, 1997.
51. Martin J. R. English Text: System and Structure. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1992.
52. McCabe A. Systemic Functional Linguistics in Teaching English Beyond School // International Journal of TESOL Studies. 2022. Vol. 4 (2).
53. McManus K. Crosslinguistic Influence and Second Language Learning. N. Y.: Routledge, 2022.
54. Mehlenbacher A. R. Registered Reports: Genre Evolution and the Research Article // Written Communication. 2019. Vol. 36 (1).
55. Miller C. Genre as Social Action // Quarterly Journal of Speech. 1984. Vol. 70.
56. Nagao A. The SFL Genre-Based Approach to Writing in EFL Contexts // Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education. 2019. URL: <https://sfleducation.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40862-019-0069-3>
57. Nava A., Pedrazzini L. Second Language Acquisition in Action: Principles from Practice. L.: Bloomsbury, 2018.
58. Negretti R., McGrath L. English for Specific Playfulness? How Doctoral Students in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Manipulate Genre // Journal of Second Language Writing. 2020. Vol. 60. URL: <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/26188>
59. Negretti R., McGrath L. Scaffolding Genre Knowledge and Metacognition: Insights from an L2 Doctoral Research Writing Course // Journal of Second Language Writing. 2018. Vol. 40. URL: http://shura.shu.ac.uk/17666/8/Negretti%20scaffolding%20genre%20knowledge_VoR.pdf
60. Norman M. K., Lotrecchiano G. R. Translating the Learning Sciences into Practice: A Primer for Clinical and Translational Educators // Journal of Clinical and Translational Science. 2021. Vol. 5. Iss. 1.
61. Paltridge B. Discourse Analysis: An Introduction. L.: Continuum, 2007.
62. Penrose A. M., Katz S. Writing in the Sciences: Exploring Conventions of Scientific Discourse. 2020. URL: <https://parlorpress.com/products/writing-in-the-sciences-exploring-conventions-of-scientific-discourse>
63. Perez-Llantada C. Grammar Features and Discourse Style in Digital Genres: The Case of Science-Focused Crowdfunding // Revista Signos: Estudios de Lengua y Literatura. 2020. Vol. 54 (105).
64. Phan N. H., Socciarelo M. Using Corpus Analysis to Teach Cover Letter Writing through Data Driven Learning in EFL/ESL Classrooms // TESOL Working Paper Series. 2020. Vol. 18.
65. Pollock T. G. How to Use Storytelling in Your Academic Writing. Techniques for Engaging Readers and Successfully Navigating the Writing and Publishing Processes. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2021.
66. Qin Jie. Potential Contribution of SFL to Task-Based Research: An Examination of Planning Effects Using Genre-Based Theme Analysis // System. 2022. Vol. 104. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X21002499?via%3Dihub>
67. Rifenburg J. M., Portanova P., Roen D. Introduction: Promises and Perils of Cognition and Writing Praxis // Pedagogical Perspectives on Cognition and Writing / ed. by J. M. Rifenburg, P. Portanova, D. Roen. Anderson: Parlor Press, 2021.
68. Rogers H. Writing Systems: A Linguistic Approach. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004a.
69. Rogers R. An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education // An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education / ed. by R. Rogers. Mahwah - L., 2004b.
70. Rose D., Martin J. R. Learning to Write, Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy in the Sydney School. Sheffield: Equinox, 2012.
71. Rothery J., Stenglin M. Exploring Literacy in School English (Write It Right Resources for Literacy and Learning). Sydney: Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Program, 1995.
72. Rowland N. J., Knapp J. A., Fargo H. Learning "Scholarship as Conversation" by Writing Book Reviews // Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly. 2019. Vol. 2 (3).
73. Ryshina-Pankova M. V. Systemic Functional Linguistics and Advanced Second Language Proficiency // The Handbook of Advanced Proficiency in Second Language Acquisition / ed. by P. A. Malovrh, A. G. Benati. Oxford - Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2018.
74. Saricaoglu A., Bilki Z., Plakans L. Syntactic Complexity in Learner-Generated Research Paper Introductions: Rhetorical Functions and Level of Move/Step Realization // Journal of English for Academic Purposes. 2021. Vol. 53. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1475158521000813?via%3Dihub>
75. Simon L. Write as an Expert: Explicit Teaching of Genres. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2005.
76. Specialized English: New Directions in ESP and EAP Research and Practice / ed. by K. Hyland, L. L. C. Wong. L. - N. Y.: Routledge; Taylor & Francis Group, 2019.
77. Swales J. M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
78. Swales J. M. Other Floors, Other Voices: Toward Textography and Beyond. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.
79. Swales J. M. Research Genres: Explorations and Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

80. Swales J. M., Feak C. B. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*. Ann Arbor: Michigan ELT, 2012.
81. Swales J. M., Feak C. B. *English in Today's Research World: A Writing Guide*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
82. Tardy C. M. *Genre-Based Writing. What Every ESL Teacher Needs to Know*. Ann Arbor: Michigan ELT, 2019.
83. Tardy C. M., Buck R. H., Pawlowski M., Slinkard J. R. Evolving Conceptions of Genre among First-Year Writing Teachers // *Composition Forum*. 2018. Vol. 38. URL: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1176413>
84. Tohalino J. A. V., Quispe L. V. C., Amancio D. R. Analyzing the Relationship between Text Features and Grants Productivity // *Scientometrics*. 2021. Vol. 126 (5).
85. Trosborg A. *Analysing Professional Genres*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2000.
86. Troyan F. J., Herazo J. D., Ryshina-Pankova M. *SFL Pedagogies in Language Education: Special Issue Introduction* // *System*. 2022. Vol. 104.
87. Webb S. The Lemma Dilemma. How Should Words Be Operationalized in Research and Pedagogy? // *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 2021. Vol. 43 (5).
88. Windsor L. C., Kronsted C. Grant Writing and the Hidden Curriculum: Mentoring and Collaboration across Disciplines // *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 2022. April. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.30349.15849
89. Zalewski J. Developing Academic Thinking in the EFL Writing Classroom: A Rationale for General-Academic Writing Assignments // *Complutense Journal of English Studies*. 2020. Vol. 28.

Информация об авторах | Author information



Аленькина Татьяна Борисовна¹, к. филол. н., доц.

¹ Московский физико-технический институт (государственный университет)



Alenkina Tatiana Borisovna¹, PhD

¹ Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology

¹ tba2104@gmail.com

Информация о статье | About this article

Дата поступления рукописи (received): 10.04.2022; опубликовано (published): 23.05.2022.

Ключевые слова (keywords): жанровая педагогика; системная функциональная лингвистика; английский для специальных целей; новая риторика; студентоцентричный подход; genre pedagogy; Systemic Functional Linguistics; English for Specific Purposes; New Rhetoric; student-centered approach.