



Facing the Challenge of Generic Hybridity in EAP Research and Pedagogy

Davud Kuhi,

*Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English, Faculty of Humanities,
Islamic Azad University, Maragheh Branch, Maragheh, Iran*

Email: davudkuhi@yahoo.com

Abstract

Since its introduction to EAP theory in the 1980s, the concept of genre has proven to be a rigorous theoretical construct for a deeper understanding of the nature of academic discourse. However, the inherent potential of this concept as a means of classifying and categorizing academic texts has also given rise to what we have called “the misconception of homogeneity”. Criticizing this misconception and drawing on the concept of hybridity/heterogeneity of scientific/academic genres, the present paper explores some of the major implications of this view for EAP research and pedagogy. It is argued that the recognition of the concept of hybridity of academic genres would result in redefining the corpus design issues, focusing on genre networks instead of single genres, trying further possibilities of triangulation, redefining the criteria for the selection of formal/functional properties in analytic projects and development of thicker explanatory frameworks. The paper also looks at possibilities of operationalizing this concept within what is called “a hybridity-sensitive EAP pedagogy” and suggests intertextuality/interdiscursivity tracing tasks and discursive conversion tasks as means of raising EAP learners’ awareness.

Keywords: Genre, Hybridity, Academic Discourse, EAP Research, EAP Pedagogy

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: Tuesday, July 28, 2020

Accepted: Saturday, December 12, 2020

Published: Thursday, January 14, 2021

Available Online: Thursday, January 7, 2021

DOI: 10.22049/jalda.2020.26894.1187

Online ISSN: 2383-2460; Print ISSN:2383-591x

Introduction

Despite the fact that we originally owe the term “genre” to literary and folklore studies and of course to some extent to film studies, development of the theory of genre within applied linguistics has taught us a number of invaluable things about how the term can and should be defined. Bloor and Bloor (2007) bring together some of these agreed-upon assumptions about the meaning of the term telling us that genres can be treated as specific products of social practices, culturally recognized forms of discourse more or less obeying socially agreed structures, and social events that use regular linguistic and discursual patterns. The term has been treated as a significant theoretical construct in Applied Linguistics in general and (Academic) Discourse Analysis in particular and has subsequently attracted a large number of scholars working in different schools: in the so-called Sydney School, which has often been characterized as a linguistically-oriented one, the term has been defined as

a “staged, goal-oriented, purposeful activity” – an activity in which speakers are engaged as members of a certain culture. They characterize it as social because those engaged in the production and comprehension actually participate in communicative events with other people; they also define it as goal-oriented because genres are used to get things done; and they call it staged because it usually takes participants a few steps to reach their goals. (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 8)

A more institutional, ideological conception of the term has emerged from the work of North American scholars, the so-called New Rhetoric School, in which genre is seen as a kind of social agreement about ways of performing things with language in particular social and cultural contexts (Miller & Bazerman, 2011), and it is argued that genres should be defined not in terms of their substance or their form of discourse but in terms of the action they are used to perform (Miller, 1984). The ESP (English for Specific Purposes) School of genre research emerging out of Swales’ (1990) pedagogical orientation has instead given priority to the concept of “communicative purpose” and has defined genre as a group of communicative events with common identifiable communicative objectives, which give rise to certain exploitable limitations regarding content and substance.

It seems that from whatever theoretical position you approach them, genres have a concrete reality in academic contexts and academic types of communication. As members of “genre networks” and “genre colonies”, as constituent elements of “genre chains”, written or oral, as exemplars of research genres or instructional genres, whether produced by novices or experts, academic communication becomes possible through genres. What we can call “genre competence” is seen as a gatekeeper of membership in academic communities; this means that you will be considered a member of a given academic community when you can both produce and comprehend the genres which shape the life and realities of that community. The significance of the concept of genre in defining a discourse community has been reflected in Swales’ (1990) defining characteristics which are necessary and sufficient for considering a group of people as a discourse community: a discourse community has a broadly

agreed set of shared public objectives, mechanisms of mutual communication among its members, uses its participatory mechanisms mainly to provide information and feedback, and uses and therefore possesses one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its purposes. It is due to such centrality in the life of academic discourse communities that much of the intellectual investment of ESP theory and practice has been devoted to understanding and operationalizing the concept of genre. Pioneered by John Swales, we have witnessed two giant steps towards understanding this concept in the history of ESP: phase one (1980s-1990s) focuses upon the concept of “communicative purpose” and can be characterized by emphasizing principles such as:

- Genres are classes of communicative events;
- The main characteristic that turns a group of communicative events into a genre is some common set of communicative objectives;
- Exemplars or instances of genres differ in terms of prototypicality;
- The rationale behind a genre creates limitations on allowable contributions in terms of their content, positioning and form;
- A discourse community's nomenclature (naming/labelling tradition) for genres is a significant source of insight;
- Established members of a particular discourse community usually possess much greater knowledge and understanding of the use and exploitation of genres than those who are novice members or outsiders;
- Genres reflect disciplinary and professional cultures.

However, phase two, whose fundamental assumptions have been laid out in Swales (2004), demonstrates a movement beyond the concept of “communicative purpose” to defining genre within a metaphorical endeavor:

- Genres as **frames of action** – genres as frames for social action, not as social actions themselves; genre knowledge necessary but not sufficient for discursive success;
- Genres as **standards** – see genres as both constraint and choice; too much freedom of choice can be debilitating for communicating our meanings;
- Genres as **biological species** – development of genres reflects the mechanisms of species change; genres evolve, develop, spread and decline;
- Genres as **families** – instances of genres usually share the main qualities of “core” exemplars or prototypes;
- Genres as **institutions** – genres are more than their material manifestations; users of genres should not be defined as distinctive identities from the genres themselves.

In light of such developments, we have witnessed the evolution of a tradition of research in Applied Linguistics known as genre analysis. Some of the general contributions of this tradition of research include identifying the ways texts are structured in terms of the sequence and organization of functional moves, identifying the features which characterize texts and help realize their communicative objectives,

examining the understandings of those who produce and consume genres, discovering the ways genres relate to their consumers' activities, and explaining language choices in light of sociocultural and psychological contexts. EAP (English for Academic Purposes) pedagogy in particular has also benefited a lot from this tradition. Some of the contributions of genre analysis to EAP pedagogy include identification of key genres in academic contexts, offering a rigorous system of classification (which is essential for EAP research and pedagogy), providing the means of understanding the expectations and values placed on genres by those inside an academic discourse community and how language is used in relation to these values and expectations, analysis of the recurrent patterns which constitute the structure of the genre (through move analysis), making learners familiar with the genres they will encounter in their target communicative events and enhancing their understanding of the values and expectations placed on them, and rhetorical consciousness-raising through learners' analyses of the practices and purposes in their fields.

What should be highlighted as an inherent quality of the research and the pedagogical implications and application emerging around the concept of genre is the power of this theoretical construct in offering a system of classification and categorization. This potential has been vividly highlighted by key figures of EAP theory. For instance, Hyland (2004, 2016) sees genres as a system of classifying and categorizing texts, representing the ways writers typically use language to respond to the communicative demands of recurring situations; he argues that the concept of genre helps us organize the common-sense, non-technical labels we use to group texts and the situations in which those texts often occur. In fact, this is a much-needed potential in EAP pedagogy which has given rise to the development of a number of theoretical models in the history of this field (e.g. register studies of the 1960s, grammatical-rhetorical studies of the 1970s and 1980s) and has finally found its clear manifestation in the theory of genre. This system of classification and categorization will offer the practitioners of EAP a convenient means of establishing correspondence between the target contexts and the types of texts which are predicted to be used in those contexts. Predictability is a desired quality in pedagogical contexts which can help syllabus designers develop ideal content for teaching/learning objectives and at the same time offer the learners a peaceful learning environment (Chang & Swales, 1999 have discussed these advantages in detail). It might be argued that based on such an approach, we would be able to predict not only the types of texts to be used in target contexts but also the formal and functional characteristics which make those texts effective and meaningful. It has usually been suggested that the main mission of ESP should be equipping the learners with the formal and functional properties of the genres/discourses they will encounter in future communicative events.

Despite such advantages, this product-oriented or ends-oriented view of language pedagogy has received a large number of criticisms (see, for instance, Widdowson, 1990). But one major misconception which arises out of the mentioned potential is what I call the misconception of *homogeneity* – exemplars of a genre represent all the qualities of the prototype in terms of functional and formal characteristics. Of course, the misconception of homogeneity does not arise from learners and practitioners' expectations *per se*. We can also trace the origins of this

misconception in the dominance of a positivistic epistemology which has resulted in defining the discourse of science as an objective discourse with the precision we usually encounter in mathematics, faceless, impersonal, remote from everyday experience and realities of life, supporting its claims and arguments with a considerable use of empirical evidence, abstract and remote from immediate awareness of human, detached from real world, shunning metaphor and other flights of rhetorical fancy, and seeking a univocal relationship between the word and object. The very outcome of such an approach to the discourse of science would be denying the possibilities of intertextuality, interdiscursivity and heterogeneity. Furthermore, despite the dominance of discourse-oriented claims and approaches, in practice we have witnessed the dominance of text-based approaches to the study of genres which have given more priority to the study of formal features rather than functional, communicative, institutional, and cultural features. This has also played a significant role in the growth of the misconception of homogeneity because texts have often been assigned to similar generic classes based on the similarities of their formal characteristics and the fundamental differences in terms of discursal functions have usually been neglected.

In Kuhl (2017a), I have criticized this conception and have, instead, offered a framework within which the hybrid, heterogeneous nature of academic/scientific genres has been developed. Drawing on a social constructivist paradigm of science, I have argued that what we call academic/scientific discourse should not be seen as class of homogeneous texts sharing the same formal and functional properties, and that academic/scientific discourses are in a constitutive relationship with other social, cultural, and historical discourses surrounding them. Recognizing the social, cultural, and historical nature of academic/scientific discourses would inevitably mean that they cannot be a homogeneous means of transmission of knowledge; hence, heterogeneity is an integral quality of such discourses. This heterogeneity and unpredictability imply that academic/scientific communication does not operate in a vacuum and its qualities are constantly shaped and reshaped by the qualities of other discourses. In that research I have outlined a number of competing discourses which usually penetrate into the discourse of science: popularization discourse, instructional/pedagogical discourse, discourse of social possibilities, dialogic/cooperative discourse, discourse of accountability to shared experience, competitive discourse, commodification discourse, writer-responsible and reader-responsible discourses, ideological/political discourse, and informal discourse. The model has contributed to a different understanding in light of which we have redefined scientific/academic discourse:

- scientific/academic discourse in general and its generic and stylistic features in particular are loosely arrayed in an intertextual network as they interact with, draw upon, and respond to other discourses and their generic, registeral, and stylistic features;
- scientific/academic discourse is in a constitutive intertextual (“interdiscursive”) relationship with other discourses: it borrows generic, stylistic, and rhetorical conventions and forms from other discourses to create a scientific/academic text; hence academic/scientific discourse

often merges what might be originally distinct orders of discourse to create new discourses;

- the meaning making system of scientific/academic discourses is the outcome of an interaction between these discourses and other discourses; a process of drawing upon and responding to other orders of discourse;
- there is a process of discourse-switching and discourse-mixing in scientific/academic discourse: a shift from one meaning-making system to another in response to a variety of socio-psychological circumstances dictated by particular communicative needs and requirements;
- scientific/academic discourses are adjusted and adapted to the social, cultural, historical, pedagogical, and ideological expectations of scientists/authors and their intended audiences, and this ensures the continuity of scientific institutions.

Defined from such a perspective, academic/scientific discourse will not be conveniently made accessible to those involved in EAP research and pedagogy. The homogeneous, idealized, faceless and impersonal character desired by some researchers, and of course ideal for developing pedagogic EAP programs, has now been replaced by a heterogeneous, interdiscursive, intertextual and “chaotic” picture of scientific/academic discourse. In the rest of this paper, I will try to outline a research/pedagogy framework within which this complexity can be appropriately addressed.

Implications for EAP Research

Corpus design issues

A fundamental question to be addressed regarding academic discourse studies is how to design the corpora in light of the concept of generic hybridity. The question is if academic genres are characterized by qualities outlined above, what sort of corpus design would lead to a better understanding of how different discourses function in the meaning making system of academic communication? If we take hybridity and heterogeneity as the guiding principles of corpus design, we have to acknowledge the necessity of a multidimensional approach to this issue. Hence, in designing corpora for academic discourse analyses, we should not approach the design issue from a pure generic classification/categorization point of view; our design should take into account multiple dimensions as discourse community-based variations, disciplinary variations, cultural variations, expertise variations, chronological variations, and even individual-rhetorical variations. Some emerging patterns of corpus design in light of such an understanding could include:

- *Generic classifications dimensions*: research article vs. thesis vs. textbook vs. handbook vs. book review vs. letter to the editor vs. report . . .
- *Disciplinary dimensions*: GENRE X in hard science vs. soft science/ applied linguistics vs. philosophy/ mathematics vs. literature . . .
- *Cross-cultural dimensions*: GENRE X by Iranian vs. Native English authors/ Nonnative vs native authors . . .

- *Expert/Novice dimensions*: GENRE X by professional authors vs novice authors
- *Individual rhetorical dimensions*: GENRE X by author Z
- *Chronological dimensions*: Evolution of GENRE X within D period
- *Mixed designs*: Genre/Discipline/Culture/ . . .

While the inclusion of the exemplars of a single generic category in the corpus to be analyzed would often lead to the misconception that all members of that generic category share the same formal and functional properties of the prototype of that generic category, designing the corpora along the multiple dimensions outlined here would provide a more realistic picture of these properties. If we expect the findings of academic discourse analysis projects to reveal a more realistic picture (which is a hybrid, heterogeneous one), this should start with corpus design considerations. Without such considerations, we would be contributing to the misconception of homogeneity.

Moving beyond a focus on single genres to genre systems

If heterogeneity is seen as an inherent quality of scientific/academic genres, a major implication for genre analysis projects in EAP research would be moving beyond a focus on single genres. Heterogeneity and hybridity would impose an intertextual, interdiscursive, and intergeneric quality to the methodology of research within which we will start to define the reality of genres not by or on themselves. In real scientific/academic communicative events, genres acquire at least some of their formal and functional qualities from their relations with other genres. This intergeneric relationship can be explored in terms of what Tardy (2011) and Yates and Orlikowski (1997) call *genre system/network analysis*—an approach to the analysis of genres which aims at examining and understanding the relationship among the genres that a community uses and also between the genres and the community. This methodological framework should take care of the following considerations:

- *Genre chains*: the methodological framework within which the nature of academic genres is to be investigated should be informed by the understanding that within the system of academic communication, what we call “intertext” borrows its orderliness from the typical patterns of circulation, use, and sequence of texts. Within this system, academic texts circulate among a particular grouping of academic community members who have specific action interests in the genres and who are related to one another by some or all of the genres which belong to this system. Bazerman (2012) provides a good example: in a medical office, we can often find texts such as appointment records, patient appointment notices, patient intake forms, medical records, transmittal slips for tests and test results, billing records, bills, payments, insurance forms, authorizations for procedures in which patients, insurers, or hospital review boards might be involved. These documents exist in particular sequences as patients move through the system. Swales (2004) conceptualizes these specific sequences of documents as “genre chains”. Hence, any attempt to truly understand the formal (textual) and functional (discoursal) properties of a member of this chain depends on an intimate understanding of how that specific member

functions within the whole chain and how it is connected to the preceding and following members of the same chain. This methodological consideration would help us understand how spoken and written texts are usually clustered together, and involve certain systematic transformations from one genre to another (Hyland, 2006) and of course would help the researchers capture some of the mechanisms and realizations of hybridity of academic genres outlined in Kuhl (2017a) and summarized above.

- *Genre colonies*: another insightful view of investigating the relationship between different genres which is expected to result in an appropriate methodology for understanding their hybrid quality comes from Bhatia's (2004) description of "colonies" of written genres. The concept of genre colonies as defined by Koester and Handford (2012) highlights the view that general genres are usually composed of some more specific sub-genres; this view also deals with the phenomenon of related genres that possess similar, but not necessarily identical, communicative goals. In fact, colonies can be defined as groupings of genres: some of these genres are very closely related (we can call them "primary members"); others are not as central to the colony (we can call them "secondary" and "peripheral" members). The genres in the colony largely share the same communicative objective, but differ in a number of ways (e.g. as discipline, profession, contexts of use or participant relationship). A good example is the colony of promotional genres, which includes "primary members" (advertisements, promotional letters and job applications); these have the primary communicative objective of "promoting a product or service to a potential customer" (Bhatia, 2004). However, "secondary" members of the colony (e.g. fund raising letters or travel brochures) would not be considered advertisements although they have a strong promotional concern; whereas "peripheral" genres usually possess other communicative goals as well, and may be considered as the primary members of other genre colonies. Many of the formal and functional properties of academic genres (and the possible deviations from the prototypes we might encounter in academic genres) can be similarly understood in terms of this hierarchy of membership of genres within different colonies. The very fact that we might encounter communicative purposes in academic genres which differ from their primary communicative purpose(s) – and hence results in penetration of other discourses in the discourse of science/academy – has to do with such different mechanisms of membership of genres in colonies.

A good instance of a genre-based research which has addressed this conception is Kuhl and Behnam (2011), which looks at the use of metadiscourse in a chain of genres (Research Article - Handbook-Scholarly Textbook - Introductory Textbook). The suggested chain draws on Fleck (1979) and Myers' (1992) discussions on the social structure of academic knowledge and the role of texts in the knowledge accreditation process: What they characterize as the accreditation process is based on the belief that scientific/academic knowledge is circulated in a developmental process that starts in the first place by empirical research; it then becomes a well-established fact which is shared and respected communally in the discourse community. This process begins with the journal article—which "bears the imprint of [the] personal and provisional" (Fleck, 1979, p. 118)—and is further carried on by the handbook and finally resides in the textbook—a genre which contains only accredited knowledge.

Based on the analysis of metadiscourse features in the suggested spectrum of genres, the authors show the significance of establishing social relationships in academic arguments, suggest some of the discursual/textual mechanisms through which this is achieved, and indicate how the social and institutional distinctions which underlie production and consumption of different genres (which constitute the mentioned chain) influence the ways metadiscourse use is shaped in academic genres.

Specifying formal vs. functional properties to be included in analysis

Basturkmen (2006) has developed a comprehensive framework within which the language description options in ESP research can be characterized. This framework divides the language description possibilities into three major categories: (a) options related to language system which includes grammatical structures, core vocabulary and patterns of text organization, (b) language use options including speech acts, genres, social interaction and words used for discipline specific meanings, and (c) combination of language system and language use options. The choice(s) ESP researchers opt for can be determined by a large number of factors including both theoretical and pedagogical considerations, but one factor which can certainly influence the feature(s) to be included in the analysis projects is the role a formal or functional or a combination of these two plays in the meaning-construction process of academic discourses. If academic meaning-making becomes possible through intertextual and interdiscursive mechanisms resulting in the hybridity of academic discourses, any attempt to include formal and functional features in research projects needs to be informed by the concept of genre hybridity. In other words, these choices cannot and should not be defined in an abstract, context-reduced framework. Researchers need to inform their choices by exploring how formal and functional features contribute to the process of construction of meaning, which in turn requires looking at how academic genres are shaped by primary and secondary communicative purposes. The misconception of homogeneity may result in a large number of wrong assumptions, one being that there are a number of predictable formal/functional properties by which genres become meaningful. However, it should be emphasized that each discourse penetrating into the discourse of science/academy becomes effective through utilizing its own unique formal/functional features. Hence, a true understanding of how a genre becomes meaningful needs to look at how multiple discourses penetrate into building blocks of that genre.

Data collection, data analysis and triangulation issues

A further implication of the way we have conceptualized academic genres for EAP research is the necessity of triangulation. This could involve data collection considerations – for example collecting data from different sources, or using different methods of data collection (e.g. questionnaires, interviews) or it could involve using different methods of analysis (e.g. corpus analysis vs. a close qualitative analysis) (see Baker & Ellece, 2011). This consideration would lead EAP discourse studies to more qualitative designs in which text analysis projects are accompanied by ethnographies, intertextual analyses, observations, journal writing, diary writing, interviews,

introspective analyses and case studies. As a good example, we can regularly encounter the integration of such qualitative designs in Hyland's research on the use of metadiscourse in academic genres. For instance, in Hyland's (1999) analysis of academic attribution and citation behaviors, he has triangulated the text analysis with interviews. In order to understand the contextual forces which push the authors to cite in specific manners, he has interviewed experienced and well-published researchers about their own citation behaviors and their thoughts on disciplinary practices. I can also highlight Wong's (2005) research on writers' mental representations of the intended audience and rhetorical purpose and the way this can influence their composition strategies. In this type of introspective design, the participants (e.g. writers of academic texts) are asked to think aloud, a process which would engage them in verbalizing all the thoughts that were going through their minds while they writing. These think-aloud protocols are analyzed in conjunction with the plans and drafts that were produced in the writing sessions. Generally, such designs will help the researchers avoid seeing everything from their own vantage-points and have a better access to the ways writers see and understand the contextual forces which shape their textual and discursive practices.

It seems that as we define the character of academic genres in light of the concept of hybridity, we will be obliged to open up the data collection and data analysis phases of research to multiple horizons. Whereas confining EAP discourse studies to pure text analyses would lead to what I have called misconception of homogeneity, multiplicity of data collection and data analysis possibilities (for example by involving the scientific/academic authors verbalize their thoughts) will help the researchers face not only the primary (conventional) communicative purposes of academic communication but also encounter the multiple invisible competing discourses which penetrate into both the formal and functional qualities of academic discourse.

Explanation issues and necessities of thicker contextualization of text analysis findings

Another significant implication of the conception of hybridity of genres for EAP research would be providing explanations for text analysis descriptions from multiple perspectives. Researchers engaged in genre analysis projects usually enrich their textual descriptions with explanations of different kinds. By such explanations, researchers usually try to reconstruct the discursive process behind textual properties. However, recognition of the hybrid nature of academic genres would mean not being satisfied with shallow explanations. This conception would encourage the researchers to evaluate text analysis findings in different contexts and test these properties against the discursive forces of the types I have outlined in Kuhl (2017a). One such approach has been suggested in Kuhl (2017b) where I have criticized some academic discourse analysis projects for sufficing with shallow descriptions and have provided a socially-informed model within which the metadiscourse qualities of academic genres can be evaluated. That model proposes that the findings of metadiscourse analyses should be explained in light of cultural patterns of thinking, shift in philosophy of language, shift in conception of generic categories, shift in philosophy of discipline, shift in philosophy of science, increasing awareness of ethical issues, hybridization of

academic modes of argument, shift in understanding the conception of individual rhetoric, and historical evolution of academic modes of argument. In a typical investigation following this proposal, Rezaei et al. (2019) have investigated how metadiscourse resources in research articles of applied linguistics have evolved over time in response to the historically developing practices of this discourse community. The research evaluates the outcomes of this diachronic design in terms of issues such as development of hard science orientation in research practices of Applied Linguistics, development of commercial and promotional discourse in academic context, and increasing specialization of research.

Implications for EAP Pedagogy

Based on the argument above, I would highlight a number of pedagogical issues to be taken into consideration in EAP programs:

Learners' expectations, teachers' expectations, demands of teaching/learning context and realities of academic communication

Despite the recognition of the conception of genre hybridity, on one hand we are still faced with a number of expectations which arise from the realities of teaching/learning contexts, some of which can be formulated as:

- learning the conventions of formal academic English is already a challenging task and it should not be made more complicated by introducing a tone of unpredictability into pedagogic context;
- introducing the concept of heterogeneity of genres will bring with itself additional complexities regarding the relationships between writers and readers, and will also increase the compositional burden of novice writers;
- novice writers might suffer from the uncertain and chaotic picture of the discourse of science created by greater hybridization of the discourse of science;
- this hybridization seems to be destroying the established conventions without suggesting a clear-cut framework that teachers and learners are used to.

On the other hand, we are face with realities of academic communication, some of which can be summarized as:

- academic/scientific discourses should not be seen as storehouse of arcane and abstract and monolithic practices which are forever frozen in time; academic/scientific discourses are expected to respond to changing and emerging contexts and the demands of new conditions. These changes are taking place and both expert and novice members of academic/scientific discourse communities should be able to adopt their rhetorical practices to them;
- English for academic/scientific purposes should aim at developing an understanding (among, for instance, the practitioners, learners, and writers) of how communicative behavior should be adjusted to unpredictable sociocultural variables;

- penetration of such variables to the discourse of science and academy is an inevitable fact beyond the control of those communicating in scientific/academic sphere. Hence, students attending scientific writing programs should be familiarized with the heterogeneous and hybrid nature of scientific discourses and be equipped with the communicative capacity to manage such heterogeneity.

What this means for EAP pedagogy is that the objectives of EAP programs should be redefined: instead of defining EAP as an approach to prepare the novice members for predictables, it should be characterized as an approach for developing the capacity to deal with unpredictable communicative events. In other words, the main mission of EAP programs should not be equipping the learners with a predictable set of formal and functional feature to perform in predictable communicative events. We need to develop the mentality among novice members that in order to communicate effectively in academic encounters, they need to face the challenge of unpredictability. This requires, in Widdowson's (1990) words, a true process syllabus.

A hybridity-sensitive critical EAP pedagogy

Achieving the above-mentioned objective requires a hybridity-sensitive EAP pedagogy, one in which novice members would be required to switch practices between one scientific setting and another, to control a range of generic features appropriate to each scientific setting and to handle the meanings and identities that each set of generic features evokes. This pedagogical approach is expected to enable learners to understand that the ways we use language in scientific communication are patterned by social institutions and interpersonal relationships among the participants of such discourse, raise the learners' awareness of the fact that scientific discourse is not a homogeneous, faceless, objective, and transparent medium of communicating scientific knowledge; rather it is a social construct with deep cultural, social origins, and enable learners identify the different social and cultural origins of scientific discourse. This approach should challenge the assumption that scientific discourse is distant from social, cultural, political, and ideological concerns. To meet such expectations, I suggest the following two types of tasks be integrated into EAP programs:

intertextuality/interdiscursivity tracing tasks: one particular type of task which is expected to raise novice members' awareness of multiple voices shaping academic discourses is what I call intertextuality/interdiscursivity tracing tasks by which I mean a set of pedagogical tasks which actively engage the novice members of scientific/academic discourse communities in recognizing intertextual/ interdiscursive signals. Having identified these intertextual/interdiscursive signals, novice members of scientific discourse communities would embark on the more crucial exercise of charting the various routes through which a given signal links up with its pretext or, as these routes are two-way systems, a given pre-text links up with its signal. Typical designs of such tasks would be:

- providing the novice members with chunks of academic texts in which a number of intertextual indices have been highlighted and asking them to link up such indices with possible pretexts;

- providing the novice members with chunks of academic texts with a/some pretext(s) and asking the learners identify the realizations of this intertextual relationship in the given chunks;

- providing the novice members with chunks of academic texts in which some intertextual indices have been highlighted and asking them to choose from among a set of pretexts the one(s) with which such indices can be more appropriately linked up.

discursive conversion tasks

By discursive conversion tasks I mean those tasks which would require the novice members to switch practices between one scientific/academic setting and another, to control a range of generic features appropriate to each scientific/academic setting and to handle the meanings and identities that each set of generic features evokes. More specifically, such tasks should prepare the novice members to reshape the formal/functional qualities of a given academic text in light of the influence of other discursive forces. These tasks can, for instance, ask the learners to reshape a given piece of academic/scientific text to sound more competitive, more cooperative, more popular, more comprehensible, more commercial, more promotional, etc. These tasks will help the learners understand how the properties of a given academic texts can be adjusted to meet the expectations of different contexts in which academic genres operate and the different audiences who receive such genres.

Conclusions

As the traditional borders between academic/scientific institutions and other institutions are changing and being reshaped, we expect more complex and unpredictable types of intertextuality and interdiscursivity to emerge in academic genres. This poses serious challenges on conventional learners/teachers' expectations in pedagogical contexts and encourages the participants of these contexts redefine the objectives of pedagogic programs. It seems defining the objectives of EAP programs in terms of predictable products runs against what really happens in academic/scientific communication, and we need to accept unpredictability and heterogeneity as the integral quality of such programs. Recognition of these different qualities will result in different research designs and different instructional approaches. What really matters is that those involved in EAP pedagogy should get rid of old misconceptions about the nature of academic discourse and always be ready for innovations which will help them adjust their activities to the demands of real academic communications.

References

Baker, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis*. London & New York: Continuum.

- Basturkmen, H. (2006). *Ideas and options in English for specific purposes*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Bazerman, C. (2012). Genre as a social action. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 226-238). London & New York: Routledge.
- Bhatia, V. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis: An introduction*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Chang, Y., & Swales, J. (1999). Informal elements in English academic writing: Threats or opportunities for advanced non-native speakers? In C. Candlin & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: texts, processes and practices* (pp. 145-167). London: Longman.
- Fleck, L. (1979). *The genesis and development of a scientific fact*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(3), 341-367.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing (3rd ed.)*. New York: Routledge.
- Koester, A., & Handford, M. (2012). Spoken professional genres. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 252-268). London & New York: Routledge.
- Kuhi, D. (2017a). Hybridity of scientific discourses: An intertextual perspective and implications for EAP pedagogy. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature*, 5(2), 61-80.
- Kuhi, D. (2017b). Towards the development of a socially-informed and process-oriented model of research in metadiscourse. In C. Hatipoglu, E. Akbas & Y. Bayyurt (Eds.), *Metadiscourse in written genres: Uncovering textual and interactional aspects of texts* (pp. 23-56). Bern: Peterlang.
- Kuhi, D., & Behnam, B. (2011). Generic variations and metadiscourse use in the writing of applied linguists: A comparative study and preliminary framework. *Written Communication*, 28(1), 97-141.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause (2nd edn)*. London: Continuum.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70(2), 151-167.

- Miller, C. R., & Bazerman, C. (2011). *Géneros textuais (Genres)*. Available at www.nigufpe.com.br/serie-bate-papoacademico-vol-1-generos-textuais
- Myers, G. (1992). Textbooks and sociology of scientific knowledge. *English for specific Purposes*, 11, 3-17.
- Rezaei, S., Kuhi, D. & Saeidi, M. (2019). Cross-sectional diachronic corpus analysis of stance and engagement markers in three leading journals of applied linguistics. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 6(2), 1-25.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2011). Genre analysis. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *Continuum companion to discourse analysis* (pp. 54-68). London & New York: Continuum.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wong, A. T. Y. (2005). Writers' mental representations of the intended audience and of the rhetorical purpose for writing and the strategies that they employed when they composed. *System*, 33, 29-47.
- Yates, J., & Orlikowski, W. (1997). Genres of organizational communication: A structural approach to studying communication and media. In C. G. A. Bryant & D. Jary (Eds.), *Antony Giddens: Critical assessments* (pp. 387-415). London: Routledge.

Author's Biography



Davud Kuhi is a full-time member of English Language Department at Islamic Azad University. He is mainly interested in Scientific / Academic Discourse Studies. A distinguishing quality of his research is exploring scientific / academic discourse from social, cultural, and institutional perspectives.
