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ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to document the ontogenetic development of Japanese EFL writers’ rhetorical awareness, writing performances, and their lexicogrammatical choices as they engaged in carefully designed genre-based tasks over one academic year. The two-semester sequence of writing courses were designed based on the Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) perspective on genre learning (Martin & Rose, 2008). Instruction also integrated the genres into tasks (Byrnes, 2006) with the guidance from task-based language teaching (TBLT) principles (Norris, 2009). A total of 30 students divided into two different proficiency levels (15 in a higher proficiency group and 15 in a lower proficiency group) participated in the study. A triangulated inquiry was employed by gathering naturalistic data from intact classes: questionnaires, interviews, free writing, teacher-researcher field notes, and pre-instructional and post-instructional writing samples produced by the students at the two different periods of each semester. Findings showed that as the students engaged in the SFL-informed genre tasks, their concerns shifted to more genre-specific rhetorical issues that could accommodate the needs of the given context. The comparisons of their pre- and post-instructional writing tasks showed that enhanced rhetorical awareness affected their actual genre production in terms of their meaning-making language choices. However, proficiency effects were markedly observed in terms of how and to what degree they were able to elaborate grammatically sophisticated expressions to realize a genre. The results suggest that improved genre awareness might enable students to expand their language choices to some extent in a way that allows them to accommodate the genre demands, although their limited language proficiency might impede the expansion of
meaning-making resources at a productive level. Explaining this phenomenon based on SFL theory, it can be argued that the ability to use more incongruent and metaphorical grammatical resources may appear at a later stage of a language learning process. Some pedagogical implications are discussed in terms of the interface between a genre-based approach to writing instructions and a task-based approach to language learning.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Genre in L2 writing research and pedagogy

Over the past three decades, a major paradigm shift has emerged in second language (L2) writing research and pedagogy. During the 1970s and most of the 1980s, experts’ focus was placed primarily on psycholinguistic and cognitive theories or what has come to be known as the process approach, which resulted in writer-centered classrooms with an emphasis on what happens in the individual writer’s mind when writing—his or her meaning-making process through the recursive processes of prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing (Zamel, 1982). In the 1990s, however, much of the theoretical and pedagogical interest shifted to a social approach and to analyses of a variety of situations in which writing takes place (Trimbur, 1994). Accordingly, experts’ focus moved to how a written text is shaped by a writer’s response to the demands of a social context, an important perspective that was disregarded in the process approach (McCabe & Whittaker, 2006). This new paradigm has been labeled as the post-process approach in the field of second language writing (Atkinson, 2003; Casanave, 2003; Matsuda, 2003; Matsuda, Canagarajah, Harklau, Hyland, & Warschauer, 2003). The main pedagogical concern of the post-process approach is to encourage student writers to pay attention to the context of the text, the purpose, the audience, and the values and expectations of the community at which the text is aimed (Hyland, 2003, 2004, 2007; Johns, 1997, 2003; Paltridge, 2004; Swales, 1990).

Criticism against the process approach was based on the following perceived
shortcomings. Writing was seen as a skill that was essentially learned, not taught, and teachers were expected to play a non-directive, facilitating role by creating a cooperative environment with minimal teacher interference. The process-oriented writing approach was strongly influenced by what Bernstein (1990) has called an invisible pedagogy, which was prevalent in North America in the 1980s. This educational practice made implicit the hierarchical relations between teachers and students, and the rules for the form and structure of language (Schleppegrell, 2002). It assumed that register knowledge would be acquired without explicit attention to the particular lexical and grammatical strategies appropriate to a particular genre, resulting in grammar and discourse structures seldom being the focus in language classrooms (Schleppegrell, 2001). The invisible pedagogy instead placed major emphasis on developing writers’ creativity by allowing them to express their voices freely. By doing so, however, this approach postponed explicit input on textual conventions and functions—the way in which meanings are socially negotiated—to the end of the writing process. As Colombi and Schleppegrell (2002), student writers found themselves held accountable for knowing a set of rules, including linguistic and grammatical resources necessary to write a genre, about which no one had directly informed them. In other words, students were barred from access to texts, knowledge, and genres that might have enabled them to gain a full membership of their academic discourse community.

The process-oriented approach was especially problematic for non-native speakers who were unfamiliar with the kinds of discourses typically expected in their target community (Schleppegrell, 2001). Consequently, it caused non-native student writers to languish in their language proficiency, as Scarcella (2002) put it, and led to a growing
skepticism among teachers against the invisible, process-oriented pedagogy. Hyland (2004) noted that teachers of non-native speaking writers found it unreasonable to claim that process was more important than product despite the fact that students’ performance was always evaluated and judged on their product. Particularly important behind their criticism was that the process approach failed to consider a number of important variables, other than the individual writer that help to guide processes and ultimately shape writing.

To compensate for the areas that had been overlooked in the process approach, the post-process approach emphasized making visible the social context which writers are engaged in, their relationship with readers, and their choices of grammar, vocabulary, and organization. It was in this paradigm shift in L2 writing research during the 1990s that a growing interest in the notion of genre emerged and that genre became a central principle of much writing pedagogy for L2 writing classroom (Matsuda et al., 2003; Tardy, 2006).

To become competent L2 writers, students need to gain a range of linguistic resources while being able to evaluate layers of contextual information, to select the most appropriate linguistic resources in context, and to use them effectively (Taguchi, 2008). Gaining both linguistic ability and contextual sensitivity at the same time, however, might not be easy for non-native speakers, and the cognitive burden of this two-fold demand might make fully mature writing competence difficult for them to acquire. However, such difficulties might be resolved, or at least mitigated with a genre pedagogy, because instruction that targets genres has a potential to help inexperienced novice writers to establish a principled link between the communicative purpose and the features of text at every discourse level (Johns, 1997) by making explicit what they need to know to facilitate the acquisition of writing skills. Hyland (2004) thus describes the main advantages of
genre-based pedagogy as “explicit, systematic, needs-based, supportive, empowering, critical, and consciousness-raising” (pp. 10-11).

In sum, genre-based pedagogy has the potential to provide novice writers, even though they learn to write within the confines of the classroom, with real-world connections to writing and language resources to fulfill specific social goals for specific readers. It is the recognition of the relationship among linguistic resources, purpose, and audience that is at the center of genre-based writing pedagogy. Importantly, developing genre knowledge plays a crucial role in expanding writers’ language choices to construct meaning in various social contexts and facilitating their trajectory from novice to expert in their target language (Hewings & North, 2006; Marshall, 2006; McDonald, 2006). The concept of a choice is fundamental to foreign language (FL) education as well as genre-based writing pedagogy, given that, as Manchón (2011) has argued, a facilitative relationship between learning to write in the FL and learning the FL must be postulated to help FL learners to become better writers. As Harklau (2002) noted: “While it is important for classroom-based studies to investigate how students learn how to write in a second language, it is equally important to learn how students learn a second language through writing” (p. 329).

1.2 Genre and ontogenetic language development

Writers’ trajectory from novice to expert has been described as ontogenesis of development in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory (Halliday & Matthiesen, 2004). This ontogenetic development, in theory, appears as the trajectory from novice writers’ reliance on prototypical and congruent forms of grammar, toward their increasingly competent command of more context-specific, metaphorical, and incongruent forms, and
finally, on to expert writers’ ability to reconcile these two ways of construing meaning in accordance with situated choices for making meaning (Byrnes, 2009; Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Halliday, 1998; Schleppegrell, 2004b). In SFL theory, thus, the ontogenetic process has been conceptualized as an indication of writers’ expanding choices in the lexicogrammar as well as the semantics (Ravelli, 1988, 2003), their “change as development of writing repertoires or proficiency such as we might hope to occur over the duration of a course” (Hood, 2008, p. 351). Given that choices or writing repertoires are expanded by knowing various genres, the ontogenetic development can also be conceptualized, in Hyland’s terms, as writers’ acquisition of “genre chains, sets, constellations, and ladders” (Hyland, 2007, p. 156) that enables learners to capture the interrelationship of genres and to meet the rhetorical demands of various written contexts. In the field of first language (L1) composition, Bazerman (1994) also succinctly accounted for the relationship between awareness of genre relations and writing development:

Competence in one domain does not particularly indicate competence in another. (…) We must look to the different kinds of problems posed by different kinds of writing, the different dimensions on which the different kinds of writing work, the different skills necessary to accomplish the various kinds of writing. (pp. 132-133)

Bazerman suggested that writers who have developed expertise in more than one domain must learn or reinvent the second domain after learning the first, as writing expertise is not easily transferable from one domain of discourse to another. Bazerman’s remarks indicate that the discourses in various public spheres (e.g., educational, institutional, and
professional settings), often dominated by written language and characterized by what Gee (1998) termed secondary discourses, differ significantly from those of ordinary interactions (i.e., primary discourses) both in their grammar and in their discourse structure (Achugar & Colombi, 2008; Colombi & Schleppegrell, 2002; Ravelli & Ellis, 2004; Schleppegrell, 2004b). The differences might exist even within genres in secondary discourses. Consequently, as novice writers are asked to write a more complex genre, they have to draw on new grammatical and lexical resources. This often requires even those first language (L1) writers whose native language is English to expand their lexicogrammatical repertoires through schooling to meet the demands of secondary discourses (Schleppegrell, 2004b). Given that the control of secondary discourses is facilitated by guided learning even for L1 writers, L2 writers can be assumed to need more systematically-designed explicit instruction and scaffolding because they are doubly challenged by both their limited linguistic resources and their lack of familiarity with the genres and registers expected in secondary discourses. Therefore, facilitating the writer’s trajectory from primary to secondary discourses should be one of the crucial goals for L2 education, and it is the construct of genre that can play a key role in promoting this development, by introducing students to “meaning-making choices” in different situations (Byrnes, 2009; Byrnes & Maxim, 2004; Byrnes, Crane, Maxim, & Sprang, 2006; Byrnes et al., 2010; Caffarel, 2006; Gee, 1998; Ryshina-Pankova, 2010).

Explicit attention to lexicogrammatical resources that construct each genre may bring much benefit to novice writers who learn the target language in foreign language (FL) contexts. Several studies have documented the superiority of a second language (SL) over a FL context in fostering the development of pragmatic ability that is the key to selecting the
most appropriate linguistic resource in context and using it effectively (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Matsumura, 2001; Taguchi, 2008). Although these studies were conducted in oral situations and therefore used *pragmatic* ability instead of *genre* knowledge to describe learners’ meaning-making capacities, the results can be applicable to writing situations. In general, FL learners’ writing experiences tend to occur within the confines of the classroom, in which writing is often simply a medium for grammar practice or vocabulary exercises (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996) or what Manchón (2011) has called writing to learn language. Accordingly, FL writers’ concerns about writing genres might be much more formal at earlier stages of development, and they might be more aware of grammatical issues than pragmatic or genre issues (Alcón, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Koike & Pearson, 2005; Takahashi, 2001, 2005). Furthermore, the culture of schooling often encourages students to consider texts primarily as repositories of factual information, such as “tests that ask students to recall and reiterate informational content only and textbooks that always seem to be written by nobody and everybody, as if the information embodied in them was beyond human composition, and beyond human question” (Haas, 1994, p. 46). Under such circumstances, FL writers are likely to approach the task of writing with the belief that such texts are autonomous and context free. This belief held by FL writers may prevent them from seeing writing as social actions performed through interactions of purpose, audience and language choice. These features of academic discourse in FL contexts suggest that it might be useful, and possibly essential, to explicitly teach appropriate genre realization patterns to novice FL writers. Receiving explicit instruction in the varieties of social functions one may encounter in a genre may provide inexperienced writers with a concrete opportunity to see “language as a meaning-making
system” (Martin, 2009, p. 11) and thus use language to achieve a certain goal in the real world.

1.3 Purpose of the present study

Bearing the aforementioned issues in mind, this study aimed to investigate how genre instruction would support FL writers’ ontogenetic progression toward advancedness in written registers. Advancedness is framed in this study as “sophisticated language use in context” and is interpreted as “diverse manifestations of cultural competence, choice among registers, and multiple speech community repertoires” (Ortega & Byrnes, 2008, p. 8). The study focused on the development of a more sophisticated understanding of meaning-form links across genres, that is, on the development of genre-appropriate rhetorical awareness, as well as on overall writing performance and lexicogrammatical choices of FL writers as they moved from a formal conceptualization of writing that they have learned from their previous FL experiences with English and with writing to a functional conceptualization of writing sustained by SFL theory and an explicit instructional focus on genre which is thought to be suitable in supporting them in their attempts to learn different registers or genres.

1.3.1 Context of the study

The participants of this study were 30 undergraduate students who learned English as a foreign language (EFL) at a private science university in Japan. The students came from two intact classes: 15 from a higher proficiency class and 15 from a lower proficiency class. The students’ placement into each class was determined by the institution based on their
scores from an in-school placement test. Both groups of students were enrolled in a two-semester sequence of genre-based writing courses taught by the researcher. The course aimed to familiarize students with both non-academic genres (i.e., genres used in personal communication, such as emails) and academic genres (i.e., genres used in academic disciplines, such as summaries) and to enable students to understand and produce appropriate written discourse. The final selection of the target genres for the study (email writing and summary writing) was based on an analysis of the institution’s needs and thus involved “educational choices about what students can and should learn (i.e., what they need to learn) at a particular stage of the curriculum” (Byrnes et al., 2010, p. 59).

The syllabus design and material development turned mainly to SFL theory because of its meaning orientation that focuses on written genres produced in a particular *context of situation* (a technical term in SFL) as a result of individuals’ meaning-making choices. In order to guide the translation of SFL-based genre pedagogy into a two-semester instructional design, this study was also inspired by ideas from Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), which allowed the unpacking of genre objectives into well-motivated task design and task sequences (Long & Crookes, 1993; Long & Norris, 2000; Norris, 2009; Skehan, 1996). How these two theoretical frameworks underpinned the genre-based writing courses will be explained in more detail in the next section.

highlighted. First, research into genre learning has been undertaken mostly in English as a second language (ESL) contexts with a particular focus on advanced graduate writers, and few comprehensive studies of inexperienced EFL writers have ever been conducted on this topic. Obtaining data primarily from ESL graduate writers may cause researchers and teachers to miss the opportunity to explore the nature of learner dynamics in L2 writing classrooms and may “diminish the capacity of L2 writing as a field to produce theoretically robust knowledge that can be useful in improving L2 writing across different settings” (Ortega, 2004, p. 8). Second, in the ESL contexts typically investigated, writers’ development has been traced mostly through in-depth ethnographic observations of the process by which they participate in their chosen disciplinary communities (i.e., a “community of practice,” in Lave & Wenger’s 1991 sense). By comparison, there has been little adequate description of how L2 writers develop both as writers and language learners—how they learn to write in the target language and how they learn the target language through writing—in the genre-based framework of classroom settings. Third and finally, from the perspective of teachers’ knowledge, little information has been available on the curriculum, syllabi, materials or tasks, and goals of the genre-based classrooms, even across the extensive number of studies that have been conducted in ESL contexts. Therefore, much remains to be clarified regarding what students accomplish at the end of the genre-based course, how teaching might influence their writing development, what kinds of writing tasks and materials are most appropriate to students at what particular time, and most importantly, whether the necessary learning takes place for all students by the end of the genre-based course.

Taking into considerations these missing dimensions in previous studies led me to the
two crucial questions suggested by Cheng (2006): When we say that the necessary learning takes place on L2 writer’s part, does this mean that she or he “is less a learner of language and writing and more a learner of genre?” and “Can these three constructs be separated at all?” (p. 82). Given that FL writers are learning language and writing simultaneously (Manchón & de Haan, 2008) and language and writing are in a reciprocally supportive relationship (Ortega, 2010), the degree to which FL writers’ genre learning contributes to their learning of language and writing is a crucial area in the L2 writing research agenda that needs to be further explored.

Thus, the present study aimed to provide theoretical and pedagogical insights into how instruction that is guided by the notions of genre and tasks plays a role in facilitating FL writers’ language and writing development. At the same time, in presenting data collected from intact classes, this study sought to contribute to knowledge about L2 writing pedagogy and practice that classroom teachers may benefit from. Taken together, this study’s goal is to describe ways in which writing curricula in FL contexts can realize a link among the four interrelated constructs—genre, tasks, language, and writing—so as to make novice writers move toward a new stage of development.

1.3.2 Theoretical framework: Systemic Functional Linguistic theory

In order to investigate FL writers’ ontogenetic development in terms of their genre knowledge, writing performances, and lexicogrammatical choices, this study draws on SFL theory (Christie, 2002; Christie & Unsworth, 2008; Halliday, 1991, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1998; Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Martin, 2009; Martin & Rose, 2008). The following characteristics point to the potential of SFL for exploring these
issues pertaining to FL writers’ ontogenetic development. First, SFL theory views linguistic phenomena as “meaning-making choices” made by individual writers. This insight is useful to the present study, which aims to trace how FL writers’ lexicogrammatical choices changed over time as they experienced task-based instruction on different genres in class. Second, within the SFL framework, schooling that involves instruction, tasks and materials, and curriculum, has been considered to be fundamental to writers’ ontogenetic development (e.g., Schleppegrell, 2004b). SFL theory has therefore been conceptualized not only as language theory but also as educational theory. This framework is well suited to the present study, which was conducted in naturally-occurring intact classes to examine possible instructional impact. Third, SFL theory sees language as a way of gaining knowledge and hence views language abilities as being inseparable from content knowledge. SFL thus presents the nexus between FL learning and the leaning of content knowledge associated with learners’ chosen disciplines. This perspective is crucial to the present study, which focused on undergraduate FL writers majoring in biology-related fields and learning English for academic and professional purposes at a Japanese scientific university.

1.3.3 Insights from SLA pedagogy: Task-Based Language Teaching

To develop a carefully designed genre-based curriculum that can promote FL learners’ writing development and language acquisition simultaneously, this study turned to the notion of task as has been systematically conceptualized within the framework of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) theory (Long & Crookes, 1993; Long & Norris, 2000; Norris, 2009; Skehan, 1996). By doing so, and drawing on the proposal by Byrnes (2002, 2005, 2009), the courses attempted to link the two important notions of genre and
task. Hence, this study purposefully uses the term genre-based tasks to show that the tasks developed in this particular study are informed by both the SFL theory and the TBLT framework.

The notion of task has been increasingly used as theoretical underpinnings for syllabus design in recent years in the field of SLA research, although they have been primarily used in efforts to strengthen oral communication (e.g., Ellis, 2005; Norris, 2009; Robinson, 2001, 2005, 2009; Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 2001). In discussions of task-based syllabi, a task is defined as an activity in which meaning is primary; there is a goal that must be attained, and the activity is outcome-evaluated (Skehan, 1996). This definition ensures that an activity that focuses on language itself with no connection to the social context may not be considered a task (Robinson, 2009). Theorized in this framework, a task-based syllabus aims to offer sequenced tasks in which learners are encouraged to use language to achieve a certain goal. Through a range of pedagogic tasks, learners can gradually link the target forms to the context in which they are used and perform a target task in the end (Norris, 2009). A nexus between genre and task seems to have a great deal of potential in helping to operationalize a writing pedagogy that is focused on a range of social functions in written language; thus, FL writers can be expected to attain reasonably competent levels of language use and writing performance in their target language.

In sum, within the larger framework of genre-based tasks, the writing done in this study is characterized, as suggested by Byrnes and Sinicrope (2008), by the nexus among genre, task, and language features: ‘genre’ understood as the target text that the FL writers in this study are to attain at the end of the course; ‘task’ understood as the means through which the FL writers can develop their genre knowledge, writing competence, and lexical
knowledge; and ‘language features’ understood as individual writers’ meaning-making choices at discourse level, at sentence level, and at lexicogrammatical level.

1.3.4 Analysis of FL writers’ lexicogrammatical choices

The changes in the FL writers’ lexicogrammatical choices were examined in terms of how successfully they were able to create meaning in a particular context based on their understanding of the subtle range of meanings that grammatical metaphor can open up.

Grammatical metaphor is a notion that was introduced into SFL theory by Michael Halliday in 1985 in his *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. According to Halliday, grammatical metaphor is defined as “variation in the expression of a given meaning” (Halliday, 1994, p. 342). Variation in this definition indicates a language user’s choice of words to make meaning from various options available. Focusing on the meaning-making options, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) referred to grammatical metaphor as “a phenomenon whereby a set of agnate (related) forms is present in the language having different mappings between the semantic and the grammatical categories” (p. 7). For example, in an informal context of situation in which we would need someone else’s help, we might choose the imperative, “Give me a hand here.” However, in a formal context of situation in which we need to get our boss to do something, we would construct a clause like “I wondered if you’d mind giving me a hand with...” (Lassen, 2003, p. 284). According to Eggins (1994), the imperative is a common, typical choice preferred in informal situations, while statements and questions are preferably chosen in formal situations. Eggins then described clause-using structures other than imperatives to express commands as grammatical metaphor in the sense that the prototypical meaning can be expressed by
them in a grammatically elaborated manner. Likewise, the following example also represents a writer’s metaphorical choice:

(a) A manager may have the best workers available, but if the manager is not able to tell them what he/she wants then they are a wasted expensive resource.

(b) Successful management requires effective communication in order to maximize the potential of the workforce.

(Ravelli, 2003, p. 51)

The sentence (b) is a rewording of (a) but demonstrates “a shift in mode towards the more ‘written’ end of the continuum, with an increase in lexical density” (Ravelli, 2003, p. 51). Importantly, such rewording contributes to a shift from more concrete to more technical and abstract meaning by shifting its focus from an individual (about manager) to an abstract process (about management, communication, and workforce). Ravelli then defined the abstract, impersonal, and technical mode as grammatical metaphor (see Chapter 2 of this dissertation, for more details on definition of grammatical metaphor).

These examples highlight that everyday meanings can be construed in new ways by choosing grammatical metaphor. This circumstance indicates that grammatical metaphor is not a component of the linguistic system but a set of semantic choices (Ravelli, 2003). That is to say, there are always “alternative lexicogrammatical realizations of a choice in the semantics” (Ravelli, 1988, p. 135, emphasis in the original), and language users are always expected to choose a maximally appropriate lexicogrammatical form to make a
meaning that can best fulfill the genre demands, paying attention to the audience and the purpose of the text. In other words, grammatical metaphor is “the meta-process behind a text” (Martin, 1992, p. 490), and a writer’s choice is always somewhere along the continuum, moving ‘to’ or ‘away from’ metaphorized style in accordance with the demands of a given genre. From this point of view, it can be argued that becoming a competent L2 writer requires “acquiring a rich set of resources best expressed in terms of facility with diverse textual repertoires in all modalities” (Byrnes et al, 2010, p. 55). It is expected that writers’ ontogenetic development can be examined by inspecting their ability to position themselves along the continuum via appropriate choices from the acquired resources and to exert control over more or less metaphorical expressions in response to contextual demands.

1.4 Outline of the dissertation

The present dissertation is organized in the following manner. Chapter 1 has discussed a justification of genre in relation to language and writing development and has introduced the purpose of this study. Chapter 2 conceptualizes the complex notion of genre and discusses the teachability of genres in language classrooms. Chapter 3 focuses on SFL perspectives on genre and genre-based writing pedagogy, which constitute the theoretical framework of this study. Chapter 4 provides a review of previous empirical studies on genre knowledge development. The chapter highlights how differently the two major schools of genre studies—English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and SFL—conceptualize genre. The chapter then provides further justification for the choice of SFL over ESP in the present genre-instructional study.
Chapter 5 states the research questions investigated and summarizes their scope and rationale on the basis of the theoretical and pedagogical issues reviewed in Chapters 1 through 4. Chapter 5 also describes the methods employed to answer the research questions, including data collection and analysis procedures. Chapter 6 explains the instructional design for the two-semester sequence of genre-based and task-based writing instruction.

Chapters 7 through 8 present the findings of the study. Chapter 7 reports on how the students learned to write emails in the FL in the first semester of the genre-based writing course, how their genre-informed rhetorical awareness changed, and if so, how the changes in rhetorical awareness are reflected or not reflected in their actual writing performances and language choices. Chapter 8 shifts the focus to summary writing, which the students learned in the second semester of the course. Based on the findings, this chapter discusses how the students tackled the expectations of the new genre, which were significantly different from those of email writing, what they learned about genre, and how their lexicogrammatical choices to rephrase the original meaning changed over time.

Chapter 9 provides a summary of the findings of the study and evaluates them in light of the research questions presented in Chapter 5. The chapter concludes with a discussion and implications of the findings, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2
THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF GENRE

2.1 A historical perspective on genre theory

Traditionally, genres were defined as written texts entirely defined by textual regularities or conventions of form and content and primarily literary, such as sonnet, tragedy, and ode (Freedman & Medway, 1994). This traditional understanding of genres as texts patterned along recognizable conventional form and content was challenged by the “social turn” (Trimbur, 1994) in composition studies, an important paradigm shift that began in the early 1990s. The reconceptualization of genre assumed that genre is a socially-approved way in which writers use language according to the aim and purpose of writing and their relationship to the audience (Johns, Bawarshi, Coe, Hyland, Paltridge, Reiff, & Tardy, 2006). In this new paradigm, genre is “neither a text type nor a situation, but rather the functional relationship between a type of text and a type of situation” (Coe, 2002, p. 194). Thus, the notions of genre have “shifted from merely rhetorical to a broader conceptualization including both rhetorical situation and context of situation” (Samraj, 2002, p. 164). Importantly, this reconception of genre has enabled researchers to overcome traditional dichotomies that might have threatened to undermine their holistic understanding of writing: form and content, product and process, individual and society. Devitt (2006) describes the most recent understandings of genre as “a unified theory of writing,” which offers us new insights into “how to unify form and content, place text within context, balance process and product, and acknowledge the role of both the individual and the social” (p. 84).
Behind the significant paradigm shift, however, considerable differences also exist among composition scholars and practitioners about how genres should be described. For example, in their recent introduction to the history, theory, research, and pedagogy of genre studies, Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) address that the most recent understandings of genre derive from the work of several significant theorists working with different agendas and from different fields: genre in literary tradition (M. M. Bakhtin, Tzvertan Todorov, Jacques Derrida); genre in linguistic traditions (with distinct approaches by M. A. K. Halliday in Systemic Functional Linguistics; and John Swales in English for Specific Purposes); genre in rhetorical and sociological traditions (Charles Bazerman); and rhetorical genre studies (Caroline Miller, Kathleen Jamieson). Even more diversity is seen in a collection edited by Bazerman, Bonini, and Figuereido (2009a) which gathered papers from the 4th International Symposium on Genre Studies (SIGET). In their introduction, the editors identified the following distinct approaches to genre as non-literary and as all represented in this collection: “rhetoric, Systemic Functional Linguistics, media and critical cultural studies, sociology, phenomenology, enunciation theory, the Geneva school of educational sequences, cognitive psychology, relevance theory, sociocultural psychology, activity theory, Gestalt psychology, and schema theory” (Bazerman et al., 2009b, p. xi).

At the broadest level, however, there are two general approaches to theorizing about genre: genre from literary perspectives and non-literary perspectives. In other words, as suggested by Flowerdew (2002) from the perspective of the L2 writing field, genre theories can be broadly distinguished as primarily non-linguistic or linguistic in their orientation. These two traditions have evolved independently and without much interest in each other, as noted by Freedman and Medway (1994) and Devitt (2000). The literary theories of genre
with a non-linguistic orientation are often associated with the field of rhetoric, particularly the work of the following rhetoricians: Fred Newton Scott [1860-1931], who emphasized the view of writing as a social act in his famous book, *The New Composition Rhetoric* (1911), based on Deweyan progressive education in writing education (Matsuda, 2003); I. A. Richards [1893-1979], who was an influential figure of the “new criticism” movement in the U.S. which emphasized close reading of poetry to discover meaning as self-contained aesthetic issue and helped contemporary compositionists to gain an understanding of Romantic theories of language, aesthetics, and rhetoric (Winterowd, 1992); Kenneth Burke [1897-1993], who focused on the social power of symbols in literature from the pragmatic perspective and emphasized the role of words to create a social meaning (Hochmuth, 1952); and Stephen Toulmin [1922-2009], who developed the theory of argumentation that can be used in evaluating and analyzing arguments in real discourse (Fulkerson, 1996). These influential figures in the field of rhetoric shaped a turning point of disciplinary theorizing in the 1950s by introducing new theoretical perspectives, which eventually became known as the “new rhetoric” in literary traditions.

Theories of genre from non-literary perspectives, on the other hand, are often associated with composition and writing across the curriculum studies and strive to make genre definitions and analysis account for language form as well as social meaning in integrated ways, as Devitt (2011) outlines. Within the non-literary genre theories from which this dissertation draws, specifically, it is customary to identify three strong traditions that began to be formally recognized as distinct in the literature published since the mid-1990s: (a) Australian Systemic Functional Linguistics (also known as the Sydney School), (b) English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and (c) North American/New Rhetorical Studies.
(this third approach is also called simply the “rhetoric” approach to non-literary genre studies by Bazerman et al., 2009b, “New Rhetoric” in Freedman & Medway’s, 1994, famous book title, and it is also known as “North American genre theory”). The official recognition of these three non-literary perspectives on genre is marked by Freedman and Medway’s (1994) edited collection titled Genre and the New Rhetoric, and by Berkenkotter and Huckin’s (1995) of-cited book titled Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication, and by subsequent exchange papers that ensured from these two works, discussing how the schools were different and whether their goals for genre pedagogy were incompatible (particularly in the field of English language teaching, e.g., Hyon, 1996).

Despite a certain unresolved tension among the three approaches, research activity in non-literary genre theory has continued to burgeon and theoretical plurality has also continued. Given such diversity and intense level of investigation and publication within non-literary genre theories, it is important to proceed into the dissertation study with an understanding of how these three influential schools of thought are different and how they can help English foreign language educators advance knowledge of genre that can be translated into useful pedagogy for supporting the linguistic and writing development of foreign language writers. Advanced knowledge of these three approaches to theorizing genre is also essential because it may enable researchers and educators to find ways to promote disciplinary collaboration between L1 and L2 compositionists. As Costino and Hyon (2010) have recently argued, the concept of genre offers common curricular guidelines that can be shared by both L1 and L2 compositionists and can therefore “serve as a bridge between writing experts, building collaborations so necessary for our students” (p. 35).
Understanding of the three genre schools also helps us to acknowledge the important roles of both explicit scaffolding of genres and experiential discovery through participation in genres. The dichotomy between explicit and implicit approaches to teaching genres sheds light on the issue of how writing can be learned. At one end of the belief continuum are those who assert that writing can be best learned through explicit instruction in its structure and forms. At the other end of the belief continuum are those who hold firm to the notion that writing cannot be taught and can be acquired only through situated experiences of writing or situated uses of particular language. In short, as Purcell-Gates, Duke, and Martineau (2007) have noted, this dichotomous debate centers on issue of power and agent. Those who assert implicit approaches argue that explicit teaching of textual forms will deny students choice in how they wish to learn and to make meanings in writing (e.g., Benesch, 1993; Freedman, 1994; Pennycook, 1997). Those who assert explicit scaffolding, on the other hand, believe that implicit approaches will deny students choice in that not teaching necessary linguistic resources hinders students’ access to their target community (e.g., Ifantidou, 2011; Johns, 2011; Santos, 2001). However, given the fact that there is not a one-size-fits-all approach that will result in effectively teaching all students in all educational contexts, the issue should not be discussed in terms of polar extremes. What is more important is to acknowledge that both approaches are needed and to investigate how the two can be balanced, adjusted, and optimally employed complementarily depending on the specific needs of each educational context. Thus, gaining a clear sense of the three genre schools is essential for researchers and teachers in order to make decisions about what combination of explicit and implicit approaches will best facilitate learning new genres or learning new language forms.
2.2 Defining genre: Three schools of thought

As discussed in the previous section, there are three broad approaches to genre research and pedagogy in the non-literary tradition of genre theory, each with its own set of assumptions about genre, research focuses, and the target learners (Hyon, 1996). The three orientations are:

1. the Australian Sydney school in the tradition of Systemic Functional Linguistics;
2. the English for Specific Purposes approach;
3. the New Rhetoric approach developed in North American composition contexts.

The following sections address the different ways in which genre is defined in each orientation and the pedagogical implications that are suggested by these definitions. Since the present study draws on the SFL theory as a conceptual framework to define genre, this orientation will be discussed first and in greater detail. The other two approaches will then be presented and contrasted with the SFL approach. Finally, the chapter will offer a rationalization for the endorsement of explicit teaching of genre espoused by SFL and adopted in the present study.

2.2.1 Systemic Functional Linguistics

The approach to genre influenced by Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) theory, generally known as the Sydney school of genre, has been developed based on the theoretical work of linguist Michael Halliday (1994) and subsequent contributions by other SFL theorists, such as James R. Martin, Francis Christie, and Ruaiya Hasan. The work of
these SFL scholars has been translated into language and literacy education in diverse contexts, including both L1 and L2 classrooms, and thus Hyland (2004) describes that the SFL approach to genre is pedagogically the most successful of the three orientations.

At the broadest level, Martin and Rose (2008) define genre in SFL as staged, goal-oriented, and social processes:

(i) *staged*: because it usually takes us more than one phase of meaning to work through a genre,

(ii) *goal-oriented*: because unfolding phrases are designed to accomplish something and we feel a sense of frustration or incompleteness if we are stopped,

(iii) *social*: because we undertake genre interactively with others. (p. 6)

The SFL notion of genre further demonstrates that the staged, goal-oriented, and social process has emerged in response to recurrent configuration of the three register variables: *field* (i.e., what is taking place), *tenor* (i.e., who is taking part), and *mode* (i.e., what part language is playing). In other words, a variety of topics (field), interactant roles (tenor), and purposes (mode) can be expressed in language. In the SFL view, investigating these three variables can lead to a systematic understanding of how genres are constituted and how they work.

SFL also provides a coherent model that explains different language resources to shape different genres. Halliday defined these resources as the three metafunctions of language: *ideational* resources for construing experience, *interpersonal* resources for negotiating social relations, and *textual* resources for organizing discourse (Martin, 2009;
Martin & Rose, 2008). These metafunctions of language complement one another and are essential resources for making meaning. This conception—the relationship between the functional goals of a genre and the linguistic resources that realize them—is integral to the SFL definition of genre (see Chapter 3, for more detailed explanation about the relationship among genre, register, and metafunctions of language).

In this way, the SFL view of genre more systematically articulates than the other two approaches to genre the precise relationship between form and meaning (and between language and content), in that it offers more explicit and more coherent tools for identifying the lexicogrammatical features that are relevant in the construction of different kinds of text types or genres and their variations as shaped by particular contexts. To delineate major concerns raised in SFL research, Christie and Unsworth (2000) emphasize that the object of language study should be a whole text (meaningful passage of language), not a decontextualized sentence or utterance.

The systematic SFL conceptions of genre and its emphasis on language as a social practice arose out of criticism against the “progressive” ideology, as the process approach was referred to by SFL scholars, that was prevalent in language and literacy education in the 1980s (Martin, 2006; Veel, 2006). In the progressive approach, direct teaching and explicit grammar instruction were considered impediment to learning writing or even harmful since it took time away from writing (this implicit method constituted a backbone of the process approach). This educational practice assumed that writing competence can be acquired without explicit attention to the particular lexical and grammatical strategies appropriate to a particular genre (Schleppegrell, 2001). SFL scholars argued that the progressivist approach to instruction put students at risk and led to literacy deficits and the
differential positioning of students within the social structure (Colombi & Schleppegrell, 2002). Of particular concern to educators and researchers interested in linguistic minorities, including non-native speaking writers, was that not all learners were equally prepared to use language in the expected ways because of their different linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds, nor did all share the same understanding that certain ways of using language are expected in their community or in their unfamiliar context of schooling (Schleppegrell, 2001). Learners who have little access to incidental learning of conventional patterns of particular genres may need opportunities for explicit attention to these genre elements if they are to learn to use them appropriately in genuine contexts. Thus, SFL-initiated educators and researchers have argued that making visible the underlying textual features of “genres of power” is more likely to provide equal opportunities for all learners to read and write the genres that will allow them to participate successfully in school and in other institutions of their society (Colombi & Schleppegrell, 2002). Importantly, as suggested by Martin (2002a), being able to write genres is not just a question of “sounding literate or learned” but it is a question of having power through those genres to effect change. SFL theory thus sees the mastery of a range of genres as “facilitating learners’ access to a range of social practices in different domains of social life, thereby enabling the formation of different voices and identities” (Byrnes et al., 2010, p. 12).

The work of the SFL genre approach was strongly informed by the work of the British sociologist Basil Bernstein (1990), especially his analysis of pedagogic discourse and education failure (Cloran, 2000; Martin, 2006; O’Donnell, 2006; Veel, 2006). For Bernstein, pedagogic discourse involves instructional discourse (i.e., the classification of
what is transmitted) and regulative discourse (i.e., the framing of how this is transmitted). SFL theorists treat the instructional discourse as facilitated by the regulative discourse, and argue that “teachers and students should be encouraged to negotiate their regulatory discourse with one another, potentially drawing on a social semiotic instructional discourse to do so” (Martin, 2006, p. 97). Figure 2.1 illustrates the position of the Australian SFL school in relation to alternative positions as far as pedagogic discourse is concerned. This model was developed by Martin (2006) based on Bernstein’s theory of pedagogic discourse. According to Martin, the vertical line of this figure shows dimensions in pedagogies, with psychologically grounded theories focusing on individual development towards the top and more sociologically grounded theories focusing on education as a tool for redistributing power among social groups towards the bottom. The horizontal line shows dimensions in pedagogies, with those emphasizing so-called discovery learning to the left (i.e., more implicit and inductive approaches) and those emphasizing mentoring and apprenticeship to the right (more explicit and guided approaches). Martin (2006) then explains that the SFL approach is located in the lower right-hand quadrant, which is characterized by a visible and interventionist approach, “with a relatively strong focus on the transmission of identified discourse competence and on the empowerment of otherwise disenfranchised groups in relation to this transmission” (Martin, 2006, p. 99).

A debate ensued between SFL and other proponents of genre-based models, on the one hand, and progressive educators, on the other, the latter seeing the explicit descriptions of genres and the accompanying interventionist pedagogy as a threat to the child’s natural, internal cognitive development and a return to behaviorist models of instruction. In the end, however, genre-based descriptions of language, if not genre-based pedagogies, became a
feature of school language syllabi in Australia by the mid-1990s, as reflected in: the Write it Right project chronicled by Veel (2006), which took place in the Disadvantaged School Program and the Adult Migrant Education Service in educational institutions in New South Wales (Veel, 2006) or the Language Assistance Center at the University of Sydney investigated by Perret (2000), among many other initiatives. The application of the SFL genre-based approach to language teaching in Australia later influenced second and foreign language pedagogies in many other countries, where many student writers need explicit description of educationally valued genres.
It is important to stress that in the SFL approach to language learning learners are no longer left on their own to understand the linguistic complexes that emerge as discourse unfolds. Instead, learners are empowered to deploy grammatical resources in order both to analyze text and to think critically about the role of language in discourse. Halliday (1996) addresses the value of having conscious knowledge of language in the following manner:
The value of having some explicit knowledge of the grammar of written language is that you can use this knowledge, not only to analyze the texts, but as a critical resource for asking questions about them: Why is the grammar organized as it is? Why has written language evolved in this way? What is its place in the construction of knowledge, the maintenance of bureaucratic and technocratic power structures, the design and practice of education? You can explore disjunctions and exploit their potential for creating new combinations of meanings. (p. 350)

Consequently, one of the major concerns of SFL theorists is explicit description of educationally valued genres, with a focus on the rhetorical patterns that make those genres the kinds of texts they are—the way in which the social context influences how language is structured for use. This idea emerged in order to improve language education, and therefore genre is defined linguistically by SFL theorists. More specifically, those working within an SFL framework argue that it is possible to describe the “schematic structure” (Martin, 1984) or “generic structure potential” (Halliday & Hasan, 1989) of texts in all situation types. Halliday and Hasan (1989), for example, described the structuring of sales encounters as follows: greeting → sales request → sale compliance → sale → purchase → purchase closure → finish. Likewise, Martin and Rose (2008) illustrated the structure of the experiment report in school science as follows: aim → equipment → steps → results and conclusion. It should be noted, however, that while each genre has its schematic or generic structures, such as those illustrated above, SFL theorists show their understanding of both the variant and invariant properties of these structures in specifying
that all the elements of structure are not obligatory, but they are optional (Christie & Unsworth, 2000). Furthermore, as advocated by Toledo (2005), although genre should be categorized according to prototypes that reflect pragmatic and perceptual aspects in communicative acts, the notion of prototype at the same time “allows for the inclusion in a given genre of cases (...) that do not seem to conform to the standard but deviate from it to different degrees” (p. 1065). The concepts of Martin’s “schematic structure” and Halliday and Hasan’s “generic structure potential” appear to be based on a rather static way of categorizing typologies, but it is also important to understand “there are no clear-cut barriers between typologies; rather, they form a continuum” (Toledo, 2005, p. 1065).

Besides seeing genres in terms of schematic and generic structure, SFL theorists also tend to describe genres in terms of their rhetorical functions, such as recount, procedure, narrative, description, report, explanation, and exposition. These rhetorical functions are sometimes referred to as “text types” (Biber, 1988) or as elements that can be combined to shape many different kinds of genres. Unlike the general definition given by Biber (1988), SFL does not differentiate genres from text types, and for this reason, the term “macrogenre” is sometimes used to refer to larger, more complex genres that consist of more basic “elemental genres” (Hyland, 2004). For instance, a macrogenre such as a cookbook might be composed of several elemental genres such as a procedure, a description, and an explanation. Likewise, elemental genres can be used to shape more than one kind of macrogenre. An elemental genre such as a description and an exposition can contribute to macrogenres such as opinion-stating essays, editorials, and letters for multiple purposes, including complaints, suggestions, and recommendations.
More recently, Teruya (2009) provided a renewed overview of the range of text types or genres, which he suggested can be complemented by the genres identified by SFL theorists working within the genre models. Teruya’s model of text type typology is depicted in Figure 2.2. According to Teruya (2009), text types are differentiated according to two of three contextual variables: “field,” the social action, and “mode,” the symbolic organization. They are not specified according to “tenor,” role structure and reader-writer relationships, the third crucial contextual variable. In terms of the field (the inner second layer of concentric circles), text types are divided into eight types according to the social semiotic processes: expounding, reporting, recreating, sharing, doing, recommending, enabling, and exploring. With regard to mode, they are organized by medium (written/spoken) and turn-taking (dialogue/monologue).
One way in which this kind of classification is useful to teachers is that it provides a coherent description of linguistic registers that can illuminate the relationship between language and context. Linguistic registers vary because what we do with language varies from context to context. Accordingly, texts produced for different purposes in different contexts have different linguistic features (Colombi & Schleppegrell, 2002). Allowing learners to analyze these linguistic features on the basis of the tripartite register variables of
field (what is talked or written about), tenor (the relationship between speaker/hearer or writer/reader), and mode (expectations for how particular texts should be organized), together with the tripartite linguistic metafunctions (ideational, interpersonal, and textual resources), can enhance students’ coherent understanding of how particular genres can be expressed using particular linguistic forms and particular rhetorical patterns. This is the central idea of the SFL approach to genre pedagogy. In other words, genre pedagogy in SFL can be characterized by teacher-supported learning or “scaffolding” (Bruner, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978). The notion of scaffolding emphasizes the importance of interaction with experienced others in the process of learning — learners’ developmental movement from their current level of performance (what they can do now with others’ help or assistance) to a level of potential performance (what they will be able to do by themselves without others’ help or assistance). Vygotsky (1978) coined the term Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to describe this gap between current and potential performance of learners, and argued that learners’ development from one level to the other (i.e., reducing ZPD gap) is facilitated through social interaction and the assistance of more experienced and skilled others. In fact, Vygotsky’s notion of scaffolding, in tandem with Halliday’s language-based theory of learning, has contributed to the development of SFL theory. According to Byrnes (2006), Vygotsky and Halliday complement each other well in their key assumptions and representations because of “Vygotsky’s approach with its higher potential for being linked to activity that is not necessarily language-based” and “Halliday’s near exclusive focus on language as a meaning-making tool (that) comes at the expense of other forms of learning, such as meaningful action” (Byrnes, 2006, p. 11). Byrne’s (2006) analysis suggests that by complementing the contribution of Halliday with that of Vygotsky, SFL can become a
comprehensive language-based theory of learning that not only explains individual lexical items in relation to the context of its occurrence but also shows how this linguistic, social, and cultural knowledge arises out of collaborative activities and interactions, including mediated internalization and subsequent externalization of the goals and process of action and interaction.

In language classrooms, one of the ways to facilitate development (i.e., scaffolding) is to help learners not only to understand genre that is presented to them, but also to deconstruct the basis on which the genre is presented (Veel, 2006). Deconstruction of the text is followed by a guided, teacher-supported practice in the genre (i.e., joint construction), which serves as a foundation for learners’ subsequent independent writing (i.e., independent construction). As learners become more independent and proficient in their control of various genres, then, they begin to link related genres, and by doing so, they can learn more sophisticated and more advanced ways of expressing a given genre, and at the same time, they can gain the increasing number of choices that they can make to construct meaning in particular contexts. These pedagogical sequences are described in a straightforward manner by Feez (1998) as the “teaching-learning cycle” and are shown in Figure 2.3. The main purposes and classroom activities associated with each phase of the cycle are summarized in Table 2.1 on the basis of Hyland (2004).
Figure 2.3  The teaching-learning cycle
(Fezz, 1998, p. 28)

Table 2.1 The purpose and classroom activities in each stage of the teaching-learning cycle
(tabular summary based on prose content in Hyland, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>The purpose of each stage</th>
<th>Guiding questions and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing the context</td>
<td>Raise student awareness of the general cultural context in which the genre is used, the social purposes it achieves, and the immediate social context of the situation.</td>
<td>- What is the text about? - What purposes does it serve? - Who produced the text, and who is the intended audience? - What choices does the writer have in formats, vocabulary, topics, etc? - What social activity does the genre normally occur in (e.g., job hunting, customer relations, academic essay writing)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deconstructing the text</td>
<td>Raise student awareness of the fact that writing differs across genres, and equip them with the resources needed to produce the text</td>
<td>- How the genre is structured? - What function does each stage serve? - What are language features to express these functions? - How are social relationships between the writer and reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Writing</td>
<td>Encoded?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the main language features of the genre?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Joint construction of the text**
   - Focuses less input and modeling and beings to act as a facilitator for collaborative writing and as a responder to student writing.
   - Ask students what the stages of the genre are, and write them on the left side of the board.
   - Tell students that they are going to write the genre on the board, stage by stage.
   - Ask for suggestions from the students about each stage.
   - Get feedback from students on appropriacy and accuracy as a teacher writes it up.
   - Ask students to extend the ideas they suggest and organize them into the stages.
   - Ask students to check that the text is correct in terms of grammatical features.

4. **Independent construction of the text**
   - Encourage students to apply what they have learned and write a text independently while the teacher looks on and gives advice from the sidelines.
   - Ask students to rewrite a text for another purpose (i.e., change the genre).
   - Ask students to research and write a workplace/disciplinary genre for a specific audience and purpose.

5. **Comparing texts**
   - Raise student awareness of how the genre they have studied is related to other genres that occur in the same or similar contexts, to other genres they have studied, and to issues of interpersonal and institutional power and ideology.
   - Ask students to research how the staging of information changes when written for different audiences and purposes.
   - Ask students to research how a key feature or text stage is used in other genres.
   - Ask students to compare written and speech genres in the same context.
   - Ask students to rewrite the genre to achieve a different rhetorical purpose.

In sum, the teaching-learning cycle helps learners to shift toward greater understanding and control of a genre in a particular context through a series of sequential steps. Teachers play a role in scaffolding learners in their writing and helping them to build on their schemata. In this way, learners’ ontogenetic development can be fostered.
Scaffolding thus provides important pedagogic support for inexperienced L2 writers who need assistance in terms of both writing and language. Scaffolding is especially beneficial in university settings, given that the discourses of the university represent a variety of academic genres, such as book reviews, lab reports, and project papers. It has been reported that many college English L2 writers, who are generally very successful language learners with high TOEFL scores, tend to encounter a number of problems in successfully completing these kinds of academic genres (e.g., Spack, 1997). However, their subject lecturers generally do not offer writing support to these learners, and instead tell them to go to the University Writing Center to ask for help as “universal panacea” (Hyland, 2004, p. 141). Given a wide range of expectations of the university discourses, supporting a trajectory of writers’ development from their reliance on non-academic, prototypical and congruent forms toward their use of academic, metaphorical, and incongruent forms ought to be a key goal of L2 education in university settings. Teacher scaffolding enhanced by the SFL approach to genre pedagogy thus offers a number of potential benefits to promote learners’ ontogenetic development. Instructional effects of the SFL approach have been discussed in much SFL-inspired research carried out in second and foreign language educational contexts (e.g., Byrnes, 2009; Christie, 2002; Colombi, 2002, 2006; Hewings & North, 2008; Mohan & Beckett, 2001; Ryshina-Pankova, 2006, 2010; Schleppegrell, 1998, 2001, 2002, 2004a, 2004b, 2006; Taverniers, 2003), and thus will be reviewed in more detail in Chapter 4.

2.2.2 English for Specific Purposes

The English for specific purposes (ESP) approach to genre is underpinned by the
genre theory addressed by John Swales (1990). Swales defined genre as structured communicative events engaged in by specific discourse communities whose members share broad communicative purposes (Swales, 1990, emphasis added). Following Swales, many ESP scholars, such as Vijay K. Bhatia, John Flowerdew, Dian Belcher, Ken Hyland, and Brian Paltridge, have pursued how communicative purposes are conveyed in textually conventionalized ways by members of a particular discourse community who regularly participate in a specific genre and who share similar communicative purposes. Specifically, ESP genre practitioners believe that communicative purposes are expressed in a sequenced manner, with a text being built up schematically through a series of moves and steps (Swales, 1990). The notion of moves in ESP might correspond to that of the schematic/generic structures in SFL noted in the previous section. However, while the SFL approach aims to provide more coherent textual features, ESP genre research is more inclined to focus on the rhetorical context or the regularly occurring activities in academic and workplace settings. Consequently, rather than looking at elemental genres or text types, such as recount, description, and explanation, ESP theorists are more interested in macrogenres, such as term paper (Mustafa, 1995), science papers (Hammond & Macken-Horarik, 1999), reports (Flowerdew, 2005), exegesis (Paltridge, 2004), film review (Pang, 2002), tourist information (Henry & Roseberry, 1998), care plans (Gimenez, 2008; Leki, 2003), and sales letter (Bhatia, 1991)—the genres that are valued as disciplinary discourses within specific discourse communities where communicative purposes are specified. Disciplinary discourses within the ESP framework encompass the meaning of “thinking and talking like an engineer (or biologist, or philosopher, and so on)” (Tardy, 2009, p. 11). That is, from the ESP perspective, genre is viewed as being more than
language; it is a conventionalized disciplinary way of being/identity, which involves not only language but also discourses that “shape our perceptions of the world, including how we communicate, act, interact, and understand” (Tardy, 2009, p. 11).

Swales’ (1990) description of the research article introduction is probably one of the most well-known examples of the descriptions of genres or disciplinary discourses. Through analysis of rhetorical moves in the research article introduction, Swales developed the “Creating a Research Space (CARS)” model. The CARS model assumed that rhetorical structure in an introduction section moves from establishing a territory (Move 1), to establishing a niche (Move 2), and then to occupying the niche (Move 3) (see Figure 2.4). The Swales’ CARS model has recently been modified by Bunton (2002) in his analysis of doctoral theses introductions from various disciplines (see Figure 2.5).

The ESP researchers’ attempts to identify rhetorical moves of a specific genre have affected the area of corpus linguistics, leading to the emergence of what is called “specialized corpora,” which was originally initiated by Biber (1988). The underlying assumption of this new kind of corpora is that genre or disciplinary discourse can be characterized by certain textual features that distinguish it from other genres and can therefore be taught to novice writers with the goal of helping them to participate in their new discourse communities (Bhatia, 2002; Johns, 1997). Accordingly, many specialized corpora have been compiled in an attempt to identify genre-specific features. The genres included in these specialized corpora are varied, ranging from academic genres, such as research articles (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 1998; Hyland, 1998, 1999, 2001a, 2001b, 2008; Hyland & Tse, 2005; Lee & Swales, 2006; Samraj, 2002), doctoral and masters theses (Bunton, 2002; Charles, 2007; Kwan, 2006; Pecorari, 2006; Thompson, 2000), school
textbooks (Reppan, 2004), and statement of purpose essays (Ding, 2007), to professional genres, such as fundraising letters (Crismore, 2004), business report (Yeung, 2007), editorial letters (Flowerdew & Dudley-Evans, 2002), and consensus statements in the medical field (Mungra, 2007). The advantage of using specialized corpora in classrooms is that learners’ rhetorical consciousness can be enhanced by asking them to explore the relationship between genres and their communicative purposes in certain social domains. It can thus be argued that a hallmark of the ESP approach is its emphasis on corpus-aided genre analysis as one means for understanding the disciplinary discourse at hand (Tardy, 2009).

Move 1. Establishing a Territory
   Step 1: Claiming a centrality, and/or
   Step 2: Making topic generalization(s), and/or
   Step 3: Reviewing items of previous research

Move 2: Establishing a Niche
   Step 1A: Counter-claiming, or
   Step 1B: Indicating a gap, or
   Step 1C: Question-raising, or
   Step 1D: Continuing a tradition

Move 3: Occupying the Niche
   Step 1A: Outlining purposes, or
   Step 1B: Announcing present research
   Step 2: Announcing principal findings
   Step 3: Indicating research article structure

Figure 2. 4 ‘Create a Research Space (CARS)’ model for the research article introductions
(Swales 1990, p. 141)
Move 1: Establishing a Territory
Steps
1. Claiming centrality
2. Making topic generalizations and giving background information
3. Defining terms
4. Reviewing previous research

Move 2: Establishing a Niche
Steps
1A: Indicating a gap in research
1B: Indicating a problem or need
1C: Question-raising
1D: Continuing a tradition

Move 3: Announcing the Present Research (Occupyng the Niche)
1. Purposes, aims or objectives
2. Work carried out
3. Method
4. Materials or Subjects
5. Findings or Results
6. Product of research / Model proposed
7. Significance / Justification
8. Thesis structure

Figure 2.5 Modified CARS model for the Ph.D. thesis introductions
(Bunton, 2002, p. 74)

Importantly, the aim of using these specialized corpora goes beyond move analysis per se to more functional, contextual, and situational use of language (Flowerdew, 2005). It asks learners to explore “the relationship between generic form and generic content” (Tardy, 2009, p. 7), that is, it asks them to explore a language user’s attempts to create meaning in ways that are appropriate to the context in which the language is used. In the end, then, the ESP approach to genres aims not only to identify communicative purposes through analysis
of rhetorical moves but also to make explicit a writer’s language choices that meet appropriately the contextual needs. The linguistic items that have been investigated to date include: expression of self (Hyland, 2001b), strategies to engage with readers (Hyland, 2001a), integral or non-integral citations (Pecorari, 2006; Thompson, 2000), evaluative verbs + *that* (Hyland & Tse, 2005), noun phrases (Charles, 2007; Lee & Swales, 2006), and metadiscourse markers (Crismore, 2004, Hyland, 1998). The findings provided by these studies have been applied to the design of L2 writing instruction (e.g., Johns, 2002) and have contributed to the development of writing tasks and materials for L2 writers (e.g., Swales & Feak, 2004).

The emergence of specialized corpora shows that from a pedagogical standpoint, the ESP approach is similar to the SFL approach in that both approaches are motivated by the teaching of textual features explicitly and both consider explicit textual analysis as being beneficial to inexperienced L2 writers. Furthermore, ESP genre teaching is influenced by the concept of scaffolding (Bruner, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978) as SFL genre teaching is (see the previous section). However, while the SFL approach draws on this concept mainly to design explicit pedagogical cycle to support student learning (e.g., deconstructing the text, guided practices, and teacher-student joint construction of the text), the ESP approach uses Vygotsky’s ideas primarily to refer to the ways in which teachers help learners to develop their understanding of their target genres’ communicative purposes and the processes through which learners participate in their target disciplinary communities. Specialized corpora serve as a pedagogical tool to raise and facilitate learners’ consciousness of and approximation to their target genres.

Another notable feature of the ESP approach to genre includes analysis of the
relationships between genres or “intertextuality.” The ESP’s emphasis on genre relations grows out of Bakhtin’s (1986) idea that genres are intertextual by nature. According to Bakhtin, as new users of genres attempt to find the preferred ways of constructing genres within a particular social setting, they often rely on previous texts that they have encountered. They draw on textual conventions or practices, even oral interactions surrounding texts, such as communications with mentors, class discussions or feedback from peers, to learn effective communication strategies and construct a new genre (Tardy, 2009). For example, in the case of a job application, genres may be networked in the following manner: Read advertisement → Research employer through company documents → Write a curriculum vitae → Write a covering application letter → Read response letter → Attend oral interview → Write acceptance letter (Hyland, 2004, p. 46). As this example describes, genres are rarely found in isolation in the real world but are intertextually networked, containing traces of prior texts, in order to carry out particular social actions and accomplish other related goals. Bakhtin’s idea of intertextuality was later developed by subsequent genre theorists, such as John Swales (2004), who labeled interlinked nature of genres as “genre chains,” and Christine Tardy (2009), who developed a more comprehensive term “genre networks.” The antecedent for this use of Bakhtin’s intertextuality within ESP genre thinking is found in L1 genre theorists working within the non-literary rhetorical tradition reviewed in the next section, for example, Amy Devitt (1991), who referred to genre relations as “genre sets,” and Charles Bazerman (1994), who used the term “systems of genres” to describe the genres available for a given rhetorical goal.

ESP-oriented scholars and educators see the understanding of genre networks in real
life as being integral to genre learning in the classroom. This is because a focus on genres as discrete entities might mask many of the larger social and textual influences on the process of creating the target genres. In academic settings, these target genres might include textbooks, summaries, and book reviews with writers’ critical analysis. In non-academic settings, they might include advertisements and inquiry emails. In workplace settings, they might include project reports and presentations. Tardy (2009) argues that heightened awareness of these genre networks might promote L2 learners’ more sophisticated understanding of the target genres and failure to do so might hinder many of the important influences on the process of genre learning.

Despite its potential for pedagogical contributions, the effectiveness of the ESP approach has not been fully investigated in naturally occurring classroom settings. Cheng (2011) insightfully pointed out that ESP genre scholars’ attempts have been mainly about analytical approaches for research purposes (that is, the analysis of genre features in corpora so as to describe genres), rather than for pedagogical purposes (that is, the translation of ESP genre insights into a systematic instructional course of action whose impact on students can be empirically investigated). Cheng goes on to argue that “research on the learners’ side of genre-based instruction is still not prevalent” (p. 70), despite the fact that in genre-based writing classroom, students are often asked to analyze genre exemplars in the process of learning to write, and that students’ attention might be on language features rather than on communicative purposes alone. Similarly, Tardy (2006) pointed out that many ESP scholars have investigated how learners develop genre knowledge through situated practice (i.e., through participation in workplace or disciplinary activity), but fewer studies have focused on their development within writing classrooms.
2.2.3 New Rhetoric

The New Rhetorical approach to genre studies denotes a movement of non-literary genre scholarship that emerged in North America in the 1980s (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010; Freedman & Medway, 1994). The approach called for the rethinking of genre on the part of L1 composition scholars who had been familiar with traditional literary genre studies. In traditional literary studies, the genres were defined by conventions of form and content and therefore focused on textual regularities, such as sonnet, tragedy, and ode. The new rhetorical non-literary genre theories of the 1980s, on the other hand, went further. As Freedman and Medway (1994) described it, “without abandoning earlier conceptions of genres as ‘types’ or ‘kinds’ of discourse, the new rhetoric approach aims to connect a recognition of regularities in discourse types with a broader social and cultural understanding of language in use” (Freedman & Medway, 1994, p. 1). That is, the new approach was keenly attuned to the broad sociocultural context of genres and as genres as social action, in addition to the textual and cognitive dimensions emphasized in traditional rhetorical genre conceptualization.

Contemporary genre scholarship in this school draws heavily on the theoretical synthesis and argument provided by Carolyn R. Miller in her article, Genre as Social Action (1984). In this seminal paper, Miller described genre as a form of social action that is “centered not on the substance or the form of the discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish” (p. 24). This definition indicates that the New Rhetorical perspectives on genre, unlike those of SFL, are informed more by rhetorical actions in response to recurring social contexts than by text types or their textual regularities. As discussed above, however, this
does not necessarily mean that textual regularities are ignored, but they are seen as “symptoms of or traces of socially constructed responses to recurring social contexts” (Freedman, 1999, p. 765). This perspective on genre has continued strong up to date in the prolific work of David Russel (1997; 1991), Charles Bazerman (1994), Carole Berkenkotter and Thomas Huckin (1995), or Amy Devitt (1993; 1996; 2000; 2004; 2006; 2011).

The theoretical assumption of the New Rhetorical approach traced back to the work of Mikhail Bakhtin, especially his essay *The Problem of Speech Genres* (1986) and his essays in *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981). Focusing on the emergence of speech in dialogic interactions between individuals, Bakhtin (1986) notes that “the speaker’s speech will be manifested primarily in the *choice of a particular speech genre*” (p. 78, emphasis in the original). By choosing a particular speech genre, speakers can realize a particular relationship between thematic content, stylistic features, and modes of interactions between participants. Bakhtin goes on to argue that not only do “we speak in definite speech genres,” but also “we are given these speech genres almost in the same way that we are given our native language” (p. 78). It should be noted, however, that by defining a genre in this way, Bakhtin did not accord an inflexible or one-sided role to genre. That is, he argued that while genres involve regularities and conventions, they are nevertheless “flexible, plastic, and free” (p. 79) and some genres are characterized by “free creative reformulation” (p. 80). Bakhtin’s notion of genre thus emphasized that actions realized by a particular speech genre are not stabilized but are always open to change and subject to negotiation.

Accordingly, scholars and practitioners in the New Rhetoric group came to draw attention to “the ways in which texts respond to the complex discursive, ideological, cultural, institutional context within which they are set” (Freedman, 1999, p. 766) on the basis of the
assumptions that “genres change, evolve, and decay” (Miller, 1984, p. 36) and are thus merely “stabilized-for-now” or “stabilized-enough sites of social and ideological action” (Schryer, 1994, p. 108).

Importantly, the New Rhetoric theory assumes that genres serve as empowering tools which provide writers with socially authorized ways of communicating, while at the same time they play a role in reinforcing the values and conventions of particular social groups. In other words, as described by Freedman (1999), genres not only respond to specific contexts but also reshape those contexts in the process of responding to them. As people construct genre through situation, they also create situation through genre. Interplay and interaction are thus at the core of the New Rhetoric approach to genres. When, for example, student writers are asked to write a request email to the school improvement committee, the writers must define a specific context in relation to the task, including who they are (their persona), who the reader is (their audience), and why they write the email (their purposes). By selecting a genre to write in, the writer has created the situation. Conversely, their creation of the situation allows the writer to write a specific genre. Genre is therefore not unidirectional but “a reciprocal dynamic within which individuals’ actions construct and are constructed by recurring context of situation, context of culture, and context of genres” (Devitt, 2004, p. 31). A corresponding focus of research has been to trace the change and evolution of specific genres in response to socio-cultural phenomena in their contexts. Bazerman (1988), for example, described the evolution of the research article in response to increasingly developing scientific knowledge. Yates (1989) examined the origin and development of the memo in response to changes in management philosophy, organization, and material conditions of businesses. Smart (1993) focused on professional discourses
employed at a central bank.

Another crucial dimension of the North American New Rhetoric approach to genres is that while genres function to empower some people, they might oppress others. According to Freedman and Medway (1994), this perspective is influenced by Paulo Freire’s critical pedagogy. Freire’s (2000) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* counters traditional education as “an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor” (p. 58) and proposes a notion of education as critique that helps students discover injustice and claim empowerment. Following this Freirean view of education, genre scholars in the New Rhetoric group extend their genre inquiry to critical analysis of genres that encompass political, ethical, and ideological issues, as Freedman and Medway (1994) noted. In classrooms, their critical analysis of genres include the following questions: “How do some genres come to be valorized?” “In whose interest is such valorization?” “What kinds of social organization are put in place or kept in place by such valorization?” “Who is excluded?” “What representations of the world are entailed?” (Freedman & Medway, 1994, p. 11). New Rhetoric theorists then argue that the absence of such questions is the ideological limitation in traditional genre studies.

For this reason, genre scholars in the New Rhetoric group are generally contrasted with those of the parallel genre groups, SFL and ESP, as shown in reviews by Hyon (1996) and Hyland (2004). The difference from SFL, in particular, might be significant because of the far greater emphasis on explicating textual features and on direct teaching of those features in SFL. North American New Rhetoric genre theorists tend to characterize the Sydney School position dominant in Australia as prescriptivism that uncritically accepts existing genres without examining power and ideology. Luke (1994) pointed out that
Sydney School researchers and educators prioritize making explicit dominant discourse of existing genres, and only secondarily see genres as ideological in function. Thus, current New Rhetoric genre scholarship emphasizes the need to commit genre scholars to critical analysis of the following issues: “What we might call ‘the labor process of genre’; the nature of the sanctioned representations, and their implications for people’s lives and experience, moral and material; the degree of accessibility of a genre to political users, as common resource or as means of exclusion; and genre maintenance as power maintenance” (Freedman & Medway, 1994, p. 15). The striking differences between the two approaches—those especially in terms of pedagogical application—then led to the debate about the teachability of genre, which will be addressed in more detail in the next section.

2.3 Debate about explicit teaching of genre

Whether genres can be explicitly taught and acquired in the classroom has been a controverted issue among genre scholars. Explicit teaching of genre, in general, involves “explicit discussions, specifying the (formal) features of the genre and/or articulating underlying rules” (Freedman, 1994, p. 194). According to Hyon (1996), SFL and ESP scholars, whose primary concerns are revealing lexicogrammatical and rhetorical features and the communicative purposes embodied in a genre, have suggested that the goal of writing instruction is to give students the formal, staged qualities of genres so that they can recognize these features in the texts that they read and use them in the texts that they write. In contrast, the New Rhetoric school, which is less interested in lexicogrammar and rhetorical structure and more focused on situational-context or functions of discourse communities, has proposed that the goal of writing instruction is not to give students the
form of genre but to make them aware that as they participate in their discourse communities, they will be better able to understand the rhetorical habits. Thus, proponents of the New Rhetoric approach have argued that genres can only be acquired within the specific milieu in which they exist (Freeman, 1993).

Freedman (1994) pointed to the importance of situated practice in genre acquisition, using the process of learning to play a sport as a metaphor. Freedman argued that understanding of a set of rules is not a single variable affecting the quality of playing a sport. Obviously, other variables such as actual skill and mental and physical ability developed through situated practice play a role. Likewise, a text is not merely the output of a set of rules that individual writers have learned. Freedman termed this simple application of a set of rules as the “recipe theory of genre” (p. 46), arguing that a wide range of texts in the real world often fails to conform with a generic recipe because of the fluidity of genre. Freedman concluded that, rather than talking about rules, it would be more meaningful to talk about the playing of a game, including “how much play the rules allow and how to play with them” (p. 47).

The debate about explicit teaching of genres was brought to the fore by a set of articles in the 1993 issue of Research in the Teaching of English. Freedman (1993a) argued that because genre knowledge is acquired subconsciously in the contexts in which it is used and many of the institutional norms that shape and constrain genres are tacit and invisible, the explicit teaching of genre is not necessary, not possible, and even harmful. Freedman’s claim was drawn from Krashen’s (1981) language acquisition hypothesis, which assumes that all second-language learning entails “acquisition”—the subconscious inferring of the rules of language use on the basis of comprehensive examples of the target language during
the process of authentic language tasks. Based on Krashen’s hypothesis, Freedman argued that competence in writing does not come from conscious study of the form but from subconscious inferring, and therefore conscious learning of the form may prevent students from enacting what they know tacitly and may inhibit their writing competence from developing.

In the same issue of the 1993 journal, William and Colomb (1993) countered Freedman’s argument by providing evidence that their students positively evaluated explicit instruction about rhetorical aspects (clarity of sentences, organization, formulating a problem, writing instructions). William and Colomb pointed out that explicit teaching of “prototypical features” of genres is necessary, not as rule-bound necessities, but as “default” instances among a range of choices. They argued that only once students gain experience and acquire the prototypes can they learn how to create texts that range beyond the prototypical. Fahnestock (1993) also countered Freedman’s argument by claiming that any craft cannot be gained without a conscious awareness of technique or without an explication of its principles.

Critics of explicit teaching have further argued that teaching the norms and conventions of certain genres might deprive learners of the opportunity to question or resist those norms (Benesch, 1993). Explicit teaching of genres in the classroom, they argue, can serve to reify power structures. Criticizing the text-oriented genre pedagogy typical of SFL and ESP approaches as “accomodationist,” these critics have advocated a more critical approach through which norms and conventions are challenged rather than accepted (Pennycook, 1997). While these claims emphasize that all students have the right to “question the status quo” (Benesch, 2001, p. 167), opponents of this critical pragmatism
argue that students first need to learn the status quo in order to challenge it (Santos, 2001). In this argument, Santos (2001) claimed that educators have the responsibility to help students become as proficient as possible in the norms and conventions of their target genres, and that failure to do so would be unethical. In a similar vein, Smith (1997) pointed out that gatekeeping and hierarchies are facts of life, and that many students have a need to learn how to participate in their new discourse community characterized by such hierarchies. Smith’s argument suggested that if there is a pressing need to learn the norms and use specialized comprehension and production skills of genres, not to resist them, then it is the responsibility for teachers to further students’ goals, not their ideological and political agenda.

The debate over the explicit teaching of genres stands inconclusive and remains important for those who teach in contexts where mastery of specialized genres is a pressing need and the key to students’ successful participation in their new discourse community. It appears, however, that there is general agreement among L2 researchers and educators that the New Rhetorician’s contribution is mainly for native speakers of English, not for non-native speakers, and that the pedagogical materials are insufficiently scaffolded for novice L2 writers who need to learn linguistic issues. For example, Johns (2008) claimed that while the New Rhetoricians’ contributions are useful and must not be ignored, “this school has not produced a pedagogy that is appropriate for novice classrooms, particularly those populated by diverse student populations” (p. 243). A similar position is adopted by Hyland (2002), who asserts that genres “take on meaning only when they are situated in real contexts of use” (p. 393). What is important for researchers and educators, therefore, is not to argue about whether teaching genres is harmful or beneficial in terms of polar
extremes, but to provide more empirical evidence supporting the harmfulness or benefit of genre-based pedagogy, including what novice L2 writers do or do not need in their real context, what they do or do not know, and how genres can, if at all, scaffold them as they learn new language and writing simultaneously. The call for more empirical evidence was also advocated by Freedman herself (1993b): “It should not be the task of the skeptics to argue against a pedagogic strategy but rather the work of the proponents to bring forward convincing research and theoretical evidence—preferably before its wholesale introduction” (p. 279).

In response to the call for more empirical evidence, a fairly sizeable number of studies have investigated how teaching and learning genres explicitly helps novice L2 writers to participate in their new discourse community mainly through in-depth ethnographic observations, all within the ESP framework (e.g., Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999; Belcher, 1994; Casanave, 1995; Dong, 1996, 1998; Fishman & McCarthy, 2001; Flowerdew, 2000; Gentil, 2005; Gimenez, 2008; Granville & Dison, 2005; Hansen, 2000; Leki, 1995, 2003; Leki & Carson, 1997; Parks, 2001; Prior, 1991; Riazi, 1997; Rose, Rose, & Page, 2008; Spack, 1988, 1997; Tardy, 2005). Less often, some studies have investigated the effect of instruction on writers’ genre knowledge development through comparison of texts written by students at different periods (e.g., Byrnes, 2009; Gosden, 1998; Hammond & Macken-Horakik, 1999; Hanauer, 1998; Henry & Roseberry, 1998; Mustafa, 1995; Pang, 2002; Sengupta, 1999; Tardy, 2009). Although these empirical studies have contributed to richer theoretical perspectives and pedagogical practices in genre-based L2 writing, they need to be followed up by more carefully designed classroom-based studies that focus on the same writers’ ontogenetic development within an intact language classroom. A
particularly unexplored issue is how L2 learners of English in foreign language contexts develop, both as writers and language learners, as they engage in systematically designed genre-based tasks and materials.

2.4 Conceptual framework of this study: The SFL conception of genre

The aforementioned discussion suggests that while genre-based pedagogy can provide learners with the confidence and necessary skills to participate more effectively in their target community, it also has the danger of prescriptivism and reductionism by reinforcing the dominant discourses and depriving learners of the opportunities to challenge and change them. This is an important and legitimate argument that researchers and educators need to know; however, they should also know that learners’ needs vary so considerably according to the contexts in which they learn genres that it might be unreasonable to argue the teachability of genres in terms of a simple dichotomy—by polarizing the genre issues into whether genre is teachable or not. Rather, this issue should be considered in terms of a continuum. That is, researchers and educators need to position themselves somewhere on the continuum between the two different orientations, by carefully investigating what their students really need in a particular educational context and how and in what ways their students’ needs can be scaffolded. More specifically, if students are rather inexperienced writers and therefore do not have explicit tools to rely on in the process of completing a particular genre, then, teachers are responsible for helping them understand conventional forms and build an essential foundation in their literacy schemata. This does not mean that teachers merely transmit templates to learners as molds into which content is poured. Rather, teachers provide learners with choices that allow
learners to make meaning in a particular context. In fact, a range of written texts in the real world occur within certain expected patterns. These patterns constitute certain genres and play a role in achieving communicative and social goals, such as writing a lab report, writing a book review, and writing an inquiry email. Each of the different genres has a constraining power that expects writers to write in a certain way, but at the same time facilitates their expression by giving them choices. The key point is that, as suggested by Iedema (1997), choice (telling us what we can do) is enabled and enhanced by constraint (telling us what is). With regard to the relationship between choice and constraint, Hyland (2004) also argued that genre-based pedagogies “make both constraints and choices more apparent to students, giving them the opportunities to recognize and make choices, and for many learners, this awareness of regularity and structure is not only facilitating but also reassuring” (p. 20). Hyland (2004) then concluded that “the ability to create meaning is made possible by awareness of the choices and constraints that the genre offers” (p. 20).

The relationship among genre, choice, and constraint has been most clearly presented in SFL theory among the three genre schools. As described above, SFL theory sees language as a system of choices by which writers can communicate certain functions, rather than as a set of rules for the form and structure. Writers make choices out of a set of options, such as singular/plural number, past/present/future tense, positive/negative polarity. Every choice embodied in a written text “carries meaning in terms of the potential choices not made” (Christie & Unsworth, 2000, p. 2, emphasis in the original). Describing meaning potential—the linguistic options or choices that are available to construct meaning in particular contexts—is a central question for research and pedagogy in SFL.

The present study draws on SFL theory as a theoretical framework because my
primary interest is in understanding the ways in which FL writers exercise choices in order to make meaning and how their choices change ontogenetically. More precisely, my decision to draw on SFL theory is based on: (1) the backgrounds of the students who participated in this study; (2) the context in which this study was conducted, and (3) the goals that this study strives to achieve. As briefly explained in Chapter 1, the participants of this study are college-level Japanese EFL writers, who are doubly challenged by both their limited linguistic resources and their lack of familiarity with target genres. Taking such backgrounds into consideration, the two consecutive genre-based writing courses were designed to help them to learn new genres, gain language choices to create a genre, and become better writers of the genre. This study was conducted in such an instructional context, aiming to trace novice FL writers’ genre-appropriate ontogenetic development both as language learners and writers of target genres. SFL appears to be the most suitable theory for this context, since the SFL approach to language helps me to “understand how students’ writing develops along a continuum of language competence, recognizing students’ strengths, even when their writing still shows many weaknesses” (Colombi, 2002, p. 68).

As a researcher and a teacher whose past, present, and future career is grounded in the EFL context of higher education in Japan, my commitment is to using SFL theory in conceptualizing genre and developing classroom tasks and materials. Through my teaching experiences at various educational levels in Japanese EFL contexts, I have witnessed many students who are struggling to learn both language and writing genre and who need to learn conventional discourses of a target genre, including rhetorical patterns, textual features, and language choices to create the genre. This anecdotal evidence has made me realize that
because of their limited linguistic proficiency and lack of writing experience, making
textual forms explicit is the most beneficial approach for these students. Failure to do so,
then, might prevent the students from participating successfully in their future community
(e.g., workplace where they would use English, or accessing international education which
would be in English, etc.). As Santos (2001) argued, many students, especially in EFL
contexts, do wish to become proficient in conventional discourses of the target language
community. Particularly in the case of English, a most powerful international language,
many EFL students are anxious to master the conventions rather than resist them. Therefore,
teachers are ethically obliged to further their goals. More recently, Byrnes et al. (2010) also
suggested that “in an FL environment, an interventionist and visible educational approach
can be expected to be at least much in demand” (p. 57). Importantly, students cannot
contribute to or criticize what they are unable to participate in. In this regard, Colombi and
Schleppegrell (2002) comments:

"Literacy education is about equity, and giving access to students who would not
otherwise be able to engage in advanced literacy is a way of enabling them to
participate in and, if they choose, to challenge the structures of society that maintain
inequity. (p. 16)"

In fact, explicit instruction about text structure is seen by many practitioners in EFL
contexts to be central to a writing curriculum, as revealed in Johns’s (2011) study, which
emphasized the importance of explicit genre teaching by presenting anecdotal accounts
provided by a group of EFL writing teachers from Asia, including Japan. According to
Johns (2011), the interest in making genre forms explicit as well as providing structural models continues today in FL writing for at least three reasons: (1) the importance of recognizing text structures for effective reading and writing in a foreign language; (2) the continued proliferation of FL textbooks and curricular materials based on what are often called “rhetorical modes,” such as comparison-contrast or cause and effect; and (3) FL instructors’ understanding of contrastive rhetoric and the long-held argument that texts are structured in different ways among different linguistic and cultural groups. The EFL writing teachers Johns worked with argued that for less proficient FL students, texts should be named, structured, and assigned based on specific textual formats or the rhetorical modes, such as illustration, exemplification, comparison, contrast, partition, classification, and so on. According to their comments, making text structures explicit benefits not only students but also teachers because this can help writing teachers to develop a series of paragraph or essay templates, thereby enabling students to learn—with confidence—the discourse structures of English.

The comments provided by the EFL writing teachers in Johns’ (2011) study suggest to me that the needs of students and teachers in EFL contexts might be best achieved by the insights of the SFL theory. As described above, within the SFL framework, it is customary to identify eight key genres: recount, information report, explanation, exposition, discussion, procedure, narrative, and news story. This traditional framework has been complemented by Teruya’s renewed genre model (2009), which identified: expounding, reporting, recreating, sharing, doing, recommending, enabling, and exploring (see Figure 2.2 in the section 2.2.1). Because of such explicitness and prototypicality, SFL curricula have been successful in various instructional contexts and have contributed significantly to
discussions of the nature of genre and genre learning. This work will be reviewed in detail in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 3
GENRE, LANGUAGE, AND CONTEXT FROM AN SFL PERSPECTIVE

This chapter explores what genre knowledge means and how it contributes to language development, focusing on how the SFL notion of genre is theoretically linked to a systematic description of language and a social context in which language is used.

3.1 Modeling language and social context

A central concern of functional linguistics is to show how the organization of language is related to its use. In SFL, this concern is pursued by modeling the interconnectedness between language and social context. Specifically, the focus of SFL is on how people use language to make meaning in different social contexts. People achieve their social goals through their choices from the sets of options that are available in the language systems. The choices that individuals can actually make are, however, constrained. Christie and Unsworth (2000) illustrate two factors that constrain the individuals’ linguistic choices. The first factor is that individuals always construct meaning within a particular social context, and that social context always constrains the range of linguistic choices that can be selected by the individuals. For examples, linguistic choices in writing a text message to a friend might be different from those in writing a blog to imagined audiences. The second factor is that not everyone within a community or a culture is given an equal amount of linguistic choices because of their linguistic and socio-cultural backgrounds, and that their access to social contexts might be constrained by their limited meaning-making choices. For example, L2 students might find it more difficult than L1 students to
participate in class and socialize with their community when using their L2 because of their limited linguistic proficiency and pragmatic competence. In this model, both language and social context contribute to realization of one another—“language construes, is construed by and (over time) reconstrues social context” (Martin, 1997, p. 4). This relationship is presented in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3. 1 Language as the realization of social context  
(Martin, 1997, p. 4)

In SFL, social context is described as “the total environment in which a text unfolds” (Halliday, 1978, p. 5) and is interpreted as stratified into two levels: context of situation and context of culture (Martin & Rose, 2008). The context of situation is the immediate context in which the language is used. For example, buying fresh food in a market in Bangkok or Singapore where prices are negotiable is quite different from buying fresh food in a
department store in Tokyo where bargaining negotiation is not common (Christie & Unsworth, 2000). As this example shows, language users’ cultures are manifested in each situation in which they interact, and each interactional situation is manifested verbally as unfolding text (Martin & Rose, 2008). This stratified system of social context is modeled in SFL as “realization” (Martin, 1997) represented in Figure 3.2.

![Figure 3.2 A stratified system of social context (Martin & Rose, 2008, p. 10)](image)

The concept of realization entails “metaredundancy” (Lemke, 1995)—the notion of patterns at one level redounding with patterns at the next level, and so on. Using this concept, SFL theorists often explain that “genre is a pattern of register patterns, just as register variables are a pattern of linguistic ones” (Martin, 2002b, p. 57). The concept of realization is also
explained by Martin and Rose (2008) as follows:

(...) patterns of social organization in a culture are realized
(‘manifested/symbolized/encoded/expressed’) as patterns of social interaction in
each context of situation, which in turn are realized as patterns of discourse in each
text. Furthermore, if each text realizes patterns in a social situation, and each
situation realizes patterns in a culture, then the stratification of context had
implications for how we thought of the types of texts we were finding. (p. 10)

The next section will offer more detailed accounts of the relation between social context
and language.

3.2. Constructing context of culture: Register, genre, and language

3.2.1 Register

SFL explains that any context of situation consists of the three major variables, all of
which influence the way language is used: field, which is concerned with the social activity,
its content or topic; tenor, which is concerned with the relationships among the individuals
involved; and mode, which is the role of language in the situation, including information
flow. These three dimensions of a situation are summarized by Halliday (1985) as follows:

*Field* refers to what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place:
what it is that the participants are engaged in, in which language figures as some
essential component. *Tenor* refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the
participants, their statuses and roles: what kind of role relationships obtain, including permanent and temporary relationships of one kind or another, both the types of speech roles they are taking on in the dialogue and the whole cluster of socially significant relationships in which they are involved. *Mode* refers to what part language is playing, what it is that the participants are expecting language to do for them in the situation: the symbolic organization of the text, the status that it has, and its function in the context. (p. 12)

These situational variables constitute the register of a text, and therefore SFL theory refers to the context of situation of a text as its register. Further, as register varies, so too do the linguistic choices individuals make. Since the choices vary systematically according to the situation, SFL refers to tenor, field, and mode as register variables. In this way, SFL analyses of an actual text necessarily links its linguistic choices to its context of use.

This set of functional relationship between language and context has been expanded by Martin and Rose (2008) in a more systematic manner. First, Figure 3.3 shows their model of dimensions of variation in *field*. With this model, Martin and Rose (2008) highlight that a field consists of sequences of activities that are oriented to some global institutional purpose, and that the ways in which activities are sequenced vary according to: (1) the degree to which they are structured and (2) whether they are about specific people and things, or about general classes of phenomena and their features. Martin and Rose (2008) then suggest that the discourse patterns of texts (i.e., the ways in which activities are sequenced) are determined by dimensions of variation in *tenor*, that is, to whom a given text is talked or written.
Their model of dimensions of variation in tenor is depicted in Figure 3.4. Tenor is, as summarized above, concerned with the relationship between speaker/hearer or writer/reader. Martin and Rose (2008) explain the nature of social relations among interlocutors with the two dimensions: status and solidarity. According to their definition, status is concerned with the degree to which the interlocutors’ relations are equal or unequal, that is, who dominates and who defers. Solidarity is concerned with social distance, that is, to what degree their relations are close or distant. For example, close equal relations might be observed in interactions between siblings or those between close friends, whereas distant equal relations are more likely to be observed in interactions between co-workers or those between acquaintances. Close unequal relations, on the other hand, might be found between a worker and their line-manager, who work together almost every day, while distant unequal relations are more likely to take place between a junior worker and a senior manager, who rarely meet.
Martin and Rose (2008) then explain that these dimensions of variation in interlocutors’ relations (i.e., dimensions in status and solidarity) significantly affect: (1) the ways in which meanings are exchanged and (2) the amount of work it takes to exchange meanings. Rose and Martin summarize these two ways of realization principles for status and solidarity as ‘proliferation’ and ‘contraction.’ Proliferation is concerned with the idea that the closer one is to someone the more meanings one has available to exchange. In other words, the greater the degree of social interaction between interlocutors, the greater the range of linguistic choices available. Contraction is concerned with the idea that the better one knows someone the less explicitness it takes. That is, the greater the degree of social interaction between interlocutors, the more likely that reduced, shortened and less-explicit linguistic choices will be taken up. One way of thinking about the idea of proliferation and contraction is to imagine how the following two situations differ: when one summarizes a source text for someone who is a member of the same disciplinary community and is familiar with the source content; and when one summarizes a source text for someone who
belongs to a different disciplinary community and is unfamiliar with the source content. The writer in the former situation might share more information with the reader for meaning exchange and might therefore have more linguistic choices available, including technical terms and reduced/shortened expressions. The writer in the latter situation, on the other hand, might be expected to provide more detailed explanations for the reader because he or she might not share the same amount of linguistic choices and also the same amount of disciplinary knowledge.

Lastly, Martin and Rose’s (2008) model of dimension of variation in mode is described in Figure 3.5. Mode is concerned with the channeling of communication, and thus with the texture of information flow. Martin and Rose (2008) focus on two variables to describe the dimensions of variation in mode.

One important variable affecting the variations in mode is the amount of work language is doing in relation to what is going on. In some contexts, language might have a small role to play since several factors other than language (e.g., visual images and interlocutors’ gestures, etc.) play a crucial role in mediating what is going on. This situation often takes place in spoken communication or in so-called primary discourses (Gee, 1998), where informal interaction is jointly constructed in real time. Language in such context is characterized by SFL theorists as “action.” In other contexts where such mediating tools are removed, language might have a larger role to mean what is going on. This situation often takes place in written communication, or in so-called secondary discourses (Gee, 1998). Since mediating tools are considerably removed in such context from sensuous experience that interlocutors might be able to see, hear, and feel, language needs to be rehearsed through planning, consideration, drafting, revision, and polishing to convey meaning. In
this case, language is used as “reflection,” which is different from language used as action in spoken, primary discourses. Thus, the first variable affecting dimensions of variation in mode can be characterized as the continuum between language as action and language as reflection.

The second key variable is concerned with the continuum between dialogue and monologue. The key factors here have to do with the degree to which interaction is jointly constructed by interlocutors in real time and how soon a response can be received (immediate or delayed). Dialogues that use language as action might be characterized by intermittent exchanges while carrying out other activities, whereas dialogues that use language as reflection might include casual conversations and arguments at the dinner table or in the coffee shop. Monologues that use language as action might include sports commentary or oral instructions for doing a task, while monologues that use language as reflection might be characterized by story telling and all forms of written texts. It should be added here, however, that with the effects of technologies of communication on the kind of interactivity that is facilitated, the distinction between monologue and dialogue in written communication becomes blurred.
With this set of functional models, Martin and Rose (2008) emphasize that this field, tenor, and mode model is essentially the framework for studying social context and its relation to text types or genres. They go on to argue that each genre involves a particular configuration of field, tenor, and mode variables, and it is impossible to make genre part of any one register variable in its own.

3.2.2 Genre

The previous section addressed that linguistic choices are always influenced by the context of situation or register variables. However, the ways in which language is used are influenced not only by the immediate context of situation but also by the context of culture. Any culturally recognizable practice, such as an admission essay or a statement of purpose submitted to Western universities and a Japanese company’s power savings policy for energy supply security, entails its own characteristic text structure and language choices. This culturally recognizable practice, by which members of the culture seek to achieve their
goals, is described as genre in SFL theory.

The genre potential of a particular culture is the possible configurations of register variables, namely, the acceptable combinations of field, tenor, and mode. SFL theorists argue that register variables of field, tenor, and mode do not freely combine but are based on the systematic combinations that are acceptable in a given culture at a particular time. Martin and Rose (2008) thus describe that register and genre are “reconstituted as social semiotic strata” (p. 16). They then argue that “stratifying register and genre in this way allowed us to develop an integrated multi-functional perspective on genre, cutting across register variables” (p. 16).

The next section will explain the ways in which context of situation (register) and context of culture (genre) influence and are influenced by the structuring and choice of language for use.

3.2.3 Metafunctions of language

As language realizes the immediate situation of context, each register variable of the social context (i.e., field, tenor, and mode) is realized by a particular functional dimension of language. The functional dimensions of language are defined by SFL theorists as the metafunctions of language that consist of three linguistic resources: ideational linguistic resources that contribute to construing experience; interpersonal linguistic resources that contribute to establishing the relationship between the participating individuals, and textual linguistic resources that contribute to organizing discourse and information flow. These functional dimensions of language (ideational, interpersonal, and textual resources) interact with the register variables (field, tenor, and mode) in order to make meaning in a particular
context in a particular culture. In other words, ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions of language constitute resources for creating register variables of field, tenor, and mode, which then constitute resources for creating a genre or generalizing across genres. The relationship among genre, register, and language is depicted in Figure 3.6.

![Figure 3.6](image)

**Figure 3.6** A stratified system of genre, register variables, and metafunctions of language (Martin and Rose, 2008, p. 17)

Christie and Unsworth (2000) explain how a particular genre is represented by a particular choice of language by exemplifying some real-life situations in which the following short text fragments might have occurred:
once upon a time

this is to certify that

on the blackboard, Miss

on your mark

Christie and Unsworth (2000) suggest that each of the short linguistic resources enable us to infer the social context in which the language plays some role. For example, ‘on the blackboard, Miss’ indicates an instructional situation in a classroom (field, ideational meaning), where students interact with their teacher (tenor, interpersonal meaning), constituting a spoken dialogue (mode, textual meaning). Another features that can be inferred from this text fragment include the relative power or status of the participants. The form of address such as ‘Miss’ enables us to infer that the speaker is a student who has less power in this classroom context. The text fragment ‘on your mark,’ on the other hand, enables us to infer that the speaker has the power to command other participants. This linguistic resource is generally used to start the relay (field, ideational meaning), where a starter tells runners to get on their starting points (tenor, interpersonal meaning), in the form of oral command (mode, textual meaning). These examples show that the three dimensions of linguistic metafunctions (three dimensions of meaning) are always constructed simultaneously in order to draw out the full meaning potential of a text.

Each of the text fragments above also enables us to infer what the full text looks like or what kind of genre is realized by each of the linguistic choices. For example, ‘once upon a time’ allows us to infer that this phrase is often used in a story, whereas ‘this is to certify’ allows us to infer that the text is constitutive of an official document. Thus, out of the
language of the text, we can not only infer the values of the register variables but we can also predict the genre from the meanings likely to be constructed in the language. This suggests that there is a consistent relationship between the context of situation and its occurrence of language that are allowable in a given culture at a particular time, which are then able to be explained by genre networks (Christie & Unsworth, 2000). The SFL model thus conceives language as a set of probabilistic systems (Halliday, 1991), serving as the means through which we can infer both register and genre by drawing attention to the probabilities of certain linguistic choices being taken up (Martin, 1997). This indicates that learners have to find the particular grammatical resources that the new language has for realizing its ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings that are constitutive parts of a register and a genre. From the SFL perspective, thus, learners’ language development can be interpreted as being intimately linked to the expansion of their registerial and genre repertoire.

Christie and Unsworth (2000) further demonstrate how the full meaning potential of a text is brought about simultaneously by three metafunctions of language, focusing on differences in the grammatical system. They do so by using the following four texts:

_Helen Murson has given out some very detailed lecture notes in her classes._

_Professor Murson has given out some very detailed lecture notes in her classes._

_Has Professor Murson given out some very detailed lecture notes in her classes?_

_Some very detailed lecture notes were given out by Professor Murson in her classes._

The first text, _Helen Murson has given out some very detailed lecture notes in her_
classes, enables us to easily construct the ideational meanings (i.e., what is going on or what is being represented) and infer the register variable, field, as university or college education. Likewise, the text enables us to infer the interpersonal meanings and the register variable, tenor, noting that the speaker has less contact with Helen Murson and merely plays a role as an information-giver. The text also enables us to infer the textual meanings, mode, presenting Helen Murson as the speaker’s focus or point of departure in the structuring of the utterance, which is probably spoken rather than written.

If the first text is changed to the second text, *Professor Murson has given out some very detailed lecture notes in her classes*, the ideational meanings are essentially the same because the same participants are involved in the same situation. The textual meanings are also the same since ‘Professor Murson’ is presented as the speaker’s focus. However, the interpersonal meanings have changed. The address ‘Professor’ indicates that the speaker is probably Professor Murson’s student and therefore the power difference between Murson and the speaker is now much greater and the relationship is now more formal. If the text is changed to the third text, *Has Professor Murson given out some very detailed lecture notes in her classes?*, changes also take place in the interpersonal meanings because the speaker has the role of information-demander rather than information giver, indicating that there is a listener in this particular situation. If the text is changed to the fourth version, *Some very detailed lecture notes were given out by Professor Murson in her classes*, the ideational and interpersonal meanings are the same as the original text. However, by changing the clause structure to the passive voice, the textual meanings have changed. The speaker’s focus is now on the lecture note rather than on the professor.

In this way, the different areas of meaning—the ideational, the interpersonal, and the
textual—can be realized by a particular lexicogrammatical choice. The grammatical systems that can realize each of the meanings are described by different elements in SFL theory. The first domain of meaning, ideational meaning, is represented by Process, Participant, and Circumstance, which are referred to as the TRANSITIVITY system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor Murson</th>
<th>has given out</th>
<th>some very detailed lecture notes</th>
<th>in her classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Circumstance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Process is always realized by a verb, meaning the action around which the clause is structured. In order for this Process to come about, some element must participate in the process. These are the Participants, which are typically realized by nominal groups, as in the examples above, but may also be realized by other elements, such as embedded clauses. For readers or listeners to gain a more detailed understanding of the core of the Process-Participant structure, additional information about the event might help; where it happened, when, why, and so on. These are the Circumstances, which are usually realized by prepositional phrases, nominal groups, or adverbs.

The second domain of meaning, interpersonal meaning, is usually manifested in a speaker/writer’s different choice in the position of the subject, which is known as the grammatical MOOD of the clause. MOOD in SFL theory is a technical grammatical term and bears no relationship to the everyday sense of mood (Ravelli, 2000). The grammatical MOODs, according to Eggins (1994), can represent four types of speech function: offer
(modulated interrogative), statement (declarative), command (imperative), and question (interrogative). This is illustrated in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Speech function and grammatical MOOD
(Based on Eggins, 1994, p. 153)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech function</th>
<th>Grammatical MOOD</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Modulated interrogative</td>
<td>Would you like an interest-free loan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>St. George is an excellent bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Vote soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Are you eligible to vote?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MOOD of the clause is dependent on the relative order of particular clause constituents, Subject and Finite of the clause. The Subject of the clause is the element which agrees with the main verb in person and number, while the Finite is the part of the verbal group which indicates tense or MODALITY. When the verbal group includes multiple auxiliaries (as in ‘they may have been voting’), the first auxiliaries will be the Finite element. When the verbal group includes the simple present and the simple past tense, the Finite element is fused with the form of the verb itself. Thus, the role of Finite can be played either by a separate auxiliary or by an indication of tense within the main verb itself (Ravelli, 2000).

Identifying the interpersonal meanings or the grammatical MOOD of a clause comes from analyzing the presence or absence of the Subject and Finite elements, and their respective order. For example, when the Subject takes place before the Finite, the MOOD is declarative, as illustrated in the following text.
Professor Murson has given out some very detailed lecture notes during classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Finite</th>
<th>Predicator</th>
<th>Complement</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Residue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, when the text begins with an auxiliary functioning as the Finite, the MOOD is typically interrogative, as shown in the following example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has</th>
<th>Professor Murson</th>
<th>given out</th>
<th>Some very detailed lecture notes</th>
<th>during classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finite</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Residue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third domain of meaning, textual meaning, is realized by word order, or more precisely, the order of the elements of the clause, which carries organizational meanings (Ravelli, 2000). As noted above and also shown in the following two texts, the order of the clause elements can be changed without changing the ideational and interpersonal meanings, yet what is selected for first position in the clause is highly significant in terms of the speaker/writer’s focus or the point of departure. This is known as the THEME/RHEME system. The THEME is the position from which the clause starts, from which a topic is developed, and is therefore usually carried by the first Participant, Process, or Circumstance of the clause. The remainder of the clause is labeled the RHEME.
Professor Murson has given out some very detailed lecture notes during classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Rheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Murson</td>
<td>Some very detailed lecture notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has given out</td>
<td>have been given out by Professor Murson in her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some very detailed lecture notes</td>
<td>classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These analyses show that the three metafunctions, or the three types of meaning, unfold simultaneously in a text, each contributing to meaning-making of the text. Meaning is always shaped on the basis of the simultaneous realizations of the three perspectives—THEME, TRANSITIVITY, and MOOD (Ravelli, 2000).

One of the pedagogical advantages given by such coherent description of the relationship among genre, register, and language is that teachers are able to recognize how the same meanings can be expressed by different lexicogrammatical resources and why one particular expression is preferred over the other. Teachers’ conscious understanding of this will then raise their awareness of the distinctions between one genre and another, which will enable them to teach their students how to distinguish between genres, let alone successfully produce a range of genres (Martin & Rose, 2008). This point is crucial in FL educational contexts, given that both teachers and students are considered to have limited access to authentic, contextualized input that helps them to analyze patterns of genre representation, and therefore the genres that native speakers can recognize and realize easily might not be differentiated. Another important pedagogical advantage is that through
such consciousness raising activities, teachers are able to provide students with concrete models of how language is used to make meaning in a given context in culturally appropriate ways. If control over the genres is accumulated through repeated experience, including explicit instruction and analysis of various models, then, learners might be able to increase their lexicogrammatical choices available to make meaning in a range of written contexts. This indicates that the SFL genre-based approach to language teaching might be able to promote both language acquisition and writing development through genre.

3.2.4 Rhetorical awareness and genre awareness

Here, it is necessary to clarify how this study defines and differentiates the two terms—rhetorical awareness and genre awareness—from the SFL perspective. Explicit clarification and definition of these terms is crucial, given that both terms have been used widely by so many different fields that there might be crossovers as well as variations in ways scholars and practitioners interpret them.

As have been discussed in the previous sections (see particularly Figures 3.2 and 3.6), SFL theorists address that texts can be analyzed in terms of the three-fold stratified system, comprising the levels of genre (i.e., context of culture), register (i.e., context of situation), and language (i.e., text in context). In this SFL model, genre is placed at the stratum of culture, which means that its social purposes or activity types are determined by the cultural context. These qualities of genres are summarized by Martin (1985):

Genres are how things get done, when language is used to accomplish them. They range from literary to far from literary forms: poems, narratives, expositions,
lectures, seminars, recipes, manuals, appointment making, service encounters, news broadcasts and so on. The term genre is used here to embrace each of the linguistically realized activity types which comprise of our culture. (p. 250)

SFL explores the social purposes or activity types of the genre by identifying three contextual variables, for example, in the case of genres that involve writing: field (what is written about), tenor (how the relationship between the writer and the audience is enacted), and mode (how meaning is delivered). These three register variables resonate with the three metafunctions of language: ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings. SFL aims to uncover the functionality of language in these three metafunctional directions and sees language as meaning-making resources that realize both contextual and cultural meaning. In other words, within SFL theory, language is defined as the means by which we can be consciously aware of both register and genre (Christie & Unsworth, 2000). Importantly, the SFL notion of genre emphasizes that these combinations of field, tenor, and mode, and those of ideational, interpersonal, and textual variables, are not arbitrary but are systematic (although also involving probabilistic choices) combinations that are allowable in a given culture at a particular time. That is to say, although text structures and language vary from context to context, there are “relatively stable underlying patterns or ‘shapes’ that organize texts so that they are culturally and socially functional” (Feez, 2002, p. 53) or “potentially definable set of genres that are recognizable to members of a culture, rather than an unpredictable jungle of social situations” (Martin & Rose, 2008, p. 17). One of the advantages of the SFL genre pedagogy is that stratifying genre, register, and language in such systematic ways enables teachers and learners to develop an “integrated

From a pedagogical perspective, the SFL notion of the three-fold stratified system of texts indicates that in teaching novice FL writers the nature of the target genre, the text needs to be deconstructed through three pedagogical stages. The first pedagogical stage involves *deconstructing the context of culture of the genre*, which requires identifying its purposes, its generic structure to accomplish the purpose, and the social settings in which the genre occurs. Identifying these generic properties of the genre is essential in that genres are characterized as “staged, goal-oriented social processes” (Martin & Rose, 2008, p. 6). Specifically, genres are staged because their purposes can be accomplished through various phases of meaning in terms of moves, both obligatory and optional; they are goal-oriented, in that meaning within the moves unfolds toward accomplishing certain goals; and they occur in social settings and are shaped for readers of particular kinds (Martin & Rose, 2008; Bynes et al., 2011). Identifying the genre’s larger social purpose as determined by the cultural context is followed by the second pedagogical phase, which involves *specifying the context of situation in which the genre occurs*. As noted above, the context of situation consists of the three register variables of a genre: field, tenor, and mode. Specifically, genres are deconstructed at this phase in terms of the content of the genre, the relationship between the writer and the reader, and how the text is delivered. The three register variables have a primary effect on the type of language that is used; therefore, the second pedagogical phase led to the third and last pedagogical phase, which involves *encouraging learners to pay conscious attention to lexicogrammatical features* in the text and their three metafunctional meanings: ideational, interpersonal, and textual.

Based on the SFL model of genre, registers, and metafunctions of language, this
study uses the term “genre awareness“ to indicate learners’ awareness of the larger social purposes or activity types of the targeted genre (i.e., the goal to be achieved at the first pedagogical stage). This study then uses the term “rhetorical awareness” to encompass awareness that arises from the second and third pedagogical stage, that is, rhetorical awareness is reserved to mean learners’ awareness of the context of situation in which the targeted genre unfolds in terms of the three register variables (i.e., knowledge of rhetorical situation) and learners’ explicit understanding of lexicogrammatical resources that are maximally appropriate in a particular situation (i.e., knowledge of genre-relevant lexicogrammatical resources). Thus, enhanced rhetorical awareness makes learners more aware of what language does in relation to the rhetorical context, thereby enabling them to select lexicogrammatical resources more effectively from the systems of choices available to them for the realization of meaning in specific contexts and act appropriately and meaningfully upon social expectations. In recent FL writing research, Negretti & Kuteeva (2011) also argue that “students’ metacognitive knowledge of the rhetorical situation and of genre-relevant aspects may help them adapt their reading and writing strategies—what they notice as readers and what choices they make as writers—to diverse contexts of academic communication” (p. 97). Although “genre awareness” and “rhetorical awareness” are often used interchangeably in previous L2 literature, the nature of these terms might not be the same, given that FL writers might find it difficult to choose appropriate language resources to realize a genre (which requires rhetorical knowledge derived from pedagogical stages 2 and 3), even though they are well aware of the social purposes or activity types of the genre (which requires genre knowledge derived from pedagogical stage 1).
3.3 Semogenesis: Kinds of language changes

The previous section discussed how register and genre are realized through the three major underlying functional components of language (i.e., metafunctions of language), focusing on the central idea of SFL that language development is associated with expansion of registers and acquisition of genre. This section delves deeper into how SFL theory illustrates language development or language change in terms of time scale.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) suggest a framework for modeling language change or “semiotic change” according to the different time scales. Their model illustrates three major types of developmental processes in which learners are involved. They are described in Figure 3.7.

![Figure 3.7 Types of language changes](Martin, 1997)

First, for relatively short-term change, such as that found in the unfolding of a text or the multiple drafts written in different stages of the whole process of writing, Halliday and Matthiessen suggest the term *logogenesis*. For the longer time frame of the development of
language in the individual, such as the individual learner’s development that can be observed in a one-year writing course, they suggest the term *ontogenesis*. To refer to longer-term change in the cultural context, such as that found in the favorable discourse patterns of the scientific community, they suggest the term *phylogenesis*.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) then propose that semiotic change takes place through the three time frames. That is, phylogenesis provides the environment for ontogenesis, which in turn provides the environment for logogenesis. More specifically, if a culture has reached its evolutionary stage (evolution), the stage provides the social context for the linguistic development of the individual. If the individual has reached a level of higher development (growth), the stage provides resources for the instantiation of the texts (unfolding). Conversely, the unfolding of a text or logogenesis provides the material for phylogenesis; in other words, texts provide the means through which individuals interact with one another to learn the system of the culture or the community, and it is through the shared understanding among individuals that the language of a culture evolves. This framework is summarized in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2 Language change and time scales in SFL (Martin, 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logogenesis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontogenesis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phylogenesis</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.1 The ontogenesis of language development

SFL studies on language development have focused particularly on ontogenetic
semiotic change (e.g., Byrnes et. al., 2010; Derewianka, 2003; Painter, 2003; Ryshina-Pankova, 2006, 2010; Torr & Simpson, 2003). The original work in this domain was conducted by Halliday (1993), who based on the study of his own son’s development focused on a toddler’s use of protolanguage all the way to advanced language capacities. Importantly, Halliday suggests that the trajectory of language development is characterized by three main periods or “ontogenetic moments.” Table 3.3 summarizes the language features of each stage of the ontogenetic moments.

Table 3.3 Stages of language development (Halliday, 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Language Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal language</td>
<td>Grammatical generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic literacy</td>
<td>Grammatical abstraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced literacy</td>
<td>Grammatical metaphor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first stage of language development that is characterized by “interpersonal language,” refers to an initial stage of development from a protolanguage to a particular language. At this stage, events and experiences are expressed by toddlers mostly through common and prototypical form. Halliday describes the linguistic resources often chosen at this first stage as congruent ways of expressing things. According to Halliday, a congruent realization is defined as unmarked language choice that “can be regarded as typical—which will be selected in the absence of any good reason for selecting another one” (Halliday, 1984, p. 16). The second stage of development is often observable during the elementary school years, and language chosen at this stage is described as the “basic literacy” of adolescents. Events and experiences at this phase are expressed by adolescents mostly in
more abstract ways than at the first phase. The second ontogenetic moment is therefore characterized by a shift from congruent ways of meaning-making to more abstract ways of meaning-making by means of analysis, synthesis, and argumentation through new lexicogrammatical choices. Finally, a third stage of development, often labeled as “advanced literacy,” characterizes the stage in which people begin to use more formal and technical form to represent events and experiences. Halliday describes the linguistic resources often chosen at this third stage, in contrast to the congruent variants at the first stage, as incongruent ways of expressing things. According to Halliday, incongruent expressions serve as more delicate options and contribute to increased delicacy in making meaning. Halliday proposes that “many of the more delicate distinctions within any system depend for their expression on what in the first instance appear as non-congruent forms” (Halliday, 1984, p. 14).

3.3.2 Grammatical metaphor

The progression from congruent to incongruent ways of meaning-making is the most crucial concept to describe language development in SFL theory. Importantly, many SFL theorists argue that the congruent-to-incongruent progression is characterized by learners’ reliance on grammatical metaphor. In SFL, grammatical metaphor is generally defined as the incongruent, technical, and marked way in which people represent events and experiences. For example, instead of saying “Because technology is getting better, people are able to write business programs faster” (a congruent, prototypical, and unmarked realization), people might say, “Advances in technology are making the writing of business programs faster,” or “Advances in technology are speeding up the writing of business
programs” (an incongruent, technical, and marked realization) (Halliday, 1994). In these three example sentences, changes occur at the level of grammar (verb→noun, or process→entity), not at the level of lexical items. It is for this reason that the marked, incongruent form is described in SFL as grammatical metaphor. Further, the three forms of realization described above are not synonymous, and the effect of the change is one of expanding the meaning potential of the language. Halliday defined the expansion of the meaning potential as “the possibility of metaphorical realization” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 592). This indicates that metaphorical construal of meaning appears at a later stage of language learning process (Simon-Vandenbergen, 2003). In other words, learners’ ontogenetic development can be tracked by examining lexicogrammatical features of the texts they produce over time, specifically by investigating whether some more sophisticated, incongruent, and metaphorical aspects of L2 knowledge and use emerge in varied areas.

Since understanding how the term ‘metaphor’ is interpreted and used in SFL theory is crucial for this study, the next section will offer more details on the SFL notion of grammatical metaphor, specifically on why gaining incongruent ways of using language is conceptualized as metaphorical process of language development within the SFL framework.

### 3.4 The SFL definition of metaphor

The concept of grammatical metaphor was first introduced by Halliday (1985). Importantly, he used the term metaphor in a way that was different from the more commonly known lexical metaphor. Traditionally, metaphor was interpreted as lexical metaphor and was viewed as variation in the use of words, that is, variation in meaning. For
example, when people judge idioms such as *let off steam*, they can find a specific relationship between the components *let off* and *steam* with their figurative references “release” and “anger” (Gibbs & O’Brien, 1990, p. 423). Similarly, phrasal verbs such as *eat up* can be interpreted with both the literal meaning of “eat” and the orientational metaphor of COMPLETION IS UP (see Yasuda, 2010). As these example show, a certain literal meaning of a word can have transferred uses or meaning, which are generally called metaphorical expressions.

Table 3.4 summarizes how the traditional view of lexical metaphor differs from Halliday’s (1985) conceptualization of grammatical metaphor. Halliday (1985) interpreted the traditional way of transferring of literal meaning to create metaphorical meaning as the “from below” viewpoint. In the “from below” perspective, language users take the words as starting point, and then express the extended meaning that can be realized by these words.

To complement this “from below” perspective, Halliday introduced a new perspective “from above.” Here, the starting point is a particular meaning and the focus is on the different ways in which this meaning can be expressed or realized. In this perspective, different expressions of one meaning are compared, and variation in the expressions of a given meaning is interpreted in terms of markedness or typicality. In sum, in his earlier study, Halliday defined metaphor as variation in the expression of a given meaning, rather than variation in the meaning of a given expression.
Table 3.4 Two perspectives on metaphorical variation (Taverniers, 2003, p. 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Traditional view: “from below”</th>
<th>New view: “from above”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Metaphor as variation in the meaning of a given expression</td>
<td>Metaphor as variation in the expression of a given meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items compared</td>
<td>Comparison of the meanings of one lexeme in different collocational contexts</td>
<td>Comparison of various grammatical configurations as expressions of the same meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items analyzed</td>
<td>Literal versus metaphorical (transferred) meanings of a given lexeme</td>
<td>Degrees of (in) congruency: congruent and less congruent expressions of a given meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>(Realization inherently plays a role in lexical metaphor, but the concept is not used in the traditional view on metaphor.)</td>
<td>The feature of congruency applies to realizations of the same meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Ravelli (1988) noted that one crucial question arises about Halliday’s concept of metaphor as grammatical variations of the same meaning: Is it completely accurate to say that two alternative lexicogrammatical realizations (a congruent and a metaphorical one) really have the same meaning? This question becomes more evident, considering the circumstance that a metaphorical expression selects or omits different aspects of the meaning configuration which is realized by an equivalent congruent expression (Taverniers, 2003). To complement the initial framework for grammatical metaphor, Ravelli (1988) proposed a refined model that took into account the fact that metaphor also involves semantic variation. In this refined model, Ravelli argued that an incongruent lexicogrammatical realization does not have exactly the same meaning as its congruent equivalent, but rather “has a feedback effect into the semantics” and hence two
alternative lexicogrammatical realizations, including a congruent and a metaphorical one, “share semantic content, but differ in detail” (Ravelli, 1988, p. 137).

It appears, however, that it would be misleading to pit the two lines of thinking on grammatical metaphor against each other — same meaning, different forms versus semantic variation as well as lexicogrammatical variation. This is because form and meaning cannot be separated and it is impossible to tell whether variations are affected by writers’ semantic processes or by lexicogrammatical processes. In fact, Halliday himself proposed that there is a link between incongruent forms and increased delicacy in meaning, indicating “many of the more delicate distinctions within any system depend for their expression on what in the first instance appear as non-congruent forms” (Halliday, 1984, p. 14). Here, the terms “delicacy” and “the more delicate distinctions” can be interpreted as semantic variation. In his later study, Halliday (1994) also clearly argued, “a piece of wording that is metaphorical has as it were an additional dimension of meaning: it ‘means’ both metaphorically and congruently” (Halliday, 1994, p. 353). These remarks indicate that grammatical metaphor can be interpreted as both lexicogrammatical variation and semantic variation. To put it another way, grammatical metaphor can be realized as a result of the writer’s attempts not only to reword but also to re-mean.

3.5 Genre knowledge, metaphorical process, and ontogenetic development

The discussion above indicate that when writing, writers are always expected to choose a maximally appropriate lexicogrammatical form to create a meaning that can best fulfill the contextual demands. In other words, genre, including contextual or register variables, influences the choice between realizing meanings congruently or metaphorically,
and the consequence of this choice is reflected in the complexity of the text (Ravelli, 1988). As described in Chapter 1, the command “Give me a hand here” would be a prototypical expression most frequently chosen in an informal situation where one asks a friend for help, whereas this expression would not be preferred in a formal situation where one asks one’s boss for help, and instead, “I wondered if you’d mind giving me a hand” would be singled out as an optimally appropriate way of realizing a meaning. In this vein, a language user’s choice is always somewhere along the continuum, moving ‘to’ or ‘away from’ metaphorized style, on the basis of their evaluation of the contextual demands. Importantly, this shift does not simply strive to make the text appear ‘more’ or ‘less’ formal, metaphorical, and incongruent, but also strives “to participate in a certain way of meaning which is valued” (Ravelli, 2003, p. 52). From this point of view, FL writers’ ontogenetic development can be defined as their overall development of metaphorical potential as well as their socialization process as indexed in expanding lexicogrammatical choices. It is thus expected that novice writers’ ontogenetic development can be examined by focusing on their awareness and understanding of the demands of a given genre as well as their ability to position themselves along the continuum and to exert control over more or less metaphorical expression in response to the contextual demands.

To investigate FL writers’ metaphorical process or expanding meaning-making resources, this study focuses primarily on two types of grammatical metaphors. One is *interpersonal metaphor*, which is in general organized by metaphors of MODALITY and MOOD (Taverniers, 2003) to indicate the writer’s attitudes and perspectives. The other is *ideational metaphor*, which is in general organized by metaphors of TRANSITIVITY (Taverniers, 2003). Nominalization is most notably characterized as ideational metaphor...
(Heyvaert, 2003), through which writers are able to pack a number of lexical items into each clause (i.e., a shift from Process to Thing), and as a result, their texts shift from the concrete towards the abstract (Halliday, 1994).

I have chosen these two types of grammatical metaphor as the key constructs because the two target genres that the FL writers learned in this study, email writing and summary writing, could best be realized by a writers’ control over interpersonal metaphors and ideational metaphors, respectively. The following sections will delve into these two types of metaphors.

3.5.1 Interpersonal grammatical metaphor

In written genres, one of the major lexicogrammatical features that might emerge at a later stage of language development includes metadiscourse markers denoting writers’ interpersonal stance, such as attitude, engagement, modality, and mood (Achugar & Colombi, 2008). Martin (1997) asserts that interpersonal meanings that are represented in mood and modality choices are referred to as “indirect speech acts” (p. 28). Thus, SFL scholars see a link between interpersonal metaphor and phenomena, such as speech acts, that have long been studied from a non-SFL perspective in the field of pragmatics, although in the field of pragmatics the emphasis is more often than not placed on oral communication (e.g., Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2011; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Koike, 1989; Matsumura, 2007; Schmidt, 1983; Trosberg, 1995), whereas SFL constructs are often directed to understanding language in written communication (e.g., Hyland, 1998; Ifantidou, 2011).

As have been identified in the function of speech acts, interpersonal grammatical
metaphors also “allow for a more explicit or implicit presence of the writer/speaker in the
discourse” (Colombi, 2006, p. 158). According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004),
interpersonal metaphors often express modal meanings outside the clause, for instance, by
means of an additional projecting clause, as illustrated in the following sentence: I don’t
believe that pudding ever will be cooked. In this sentence, I don’t believe allows a speaker
to express his or her opinions in a separate clause. Halliday and Matthiessen describes the
clause I don’t believe as the “cognitive mental clause,” explaining that it “is a metaphorical
realization of probability: the probability is realized by a mental clause as if it was a figure
of sensing” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 614, emphasis in the original). Through such
metaphorical realization, the clause serves not only as the projecting part of a clause nexus
of projection, but also as a mood, just as probably does. In other words, the clause is a
variant of Pudding probably will never be cooked (a congruent realization). In sum,
modality (i.e., a speaker’s angle or his or her own point of view) is realized by the
projecting mental clause in a hypotactic clause nexus (subordinating) and the proposition is
realized by the projected idea clause. A modal proposition is thus realized by a nexus of
two clauses, rather than a single clause. This phenomenon indicates that additional
structural layers realized by grammatical metaphor leads to an expansion of the meaning
potential: “by creating new patterns of structural realization, it opens up new systemic
domains of meaning” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 626).

Halliday further demonstrated the additional structural layers realized by
interpersonal metaphorical modalities and their contribution to expanding the meaning
potential by looking at modal proposals, such as I urge you to vote against.... What the
speaker is saying in this sentence is Vote against..., which is an imperative clause that
functions as “the congruent realization of a proposal of the subtype ‘command’” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 627). The command “vote against” is then realized metaphorically by a hypotactic clause nexus “I urge you to...,” which explicitly conveys the speaker’s orientation. Likewise, the following projecting clauses control the delicacy of differentiation in creating the meaning of command:

- *I want you to...*
- *I would strongly advise you...*
- *May I ask you to...?*
- *We’d like...*
- *Can I ask you...?*
- *Would you...?*
- *I wonder if you’d...*  
  (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp. 627-628)

Halliday then argues that which wording is preferred and chosen by a speaker is always affected by the contextual variables of tenor, including status, formality, and politeness. In other words, the potential for negotiation in a dialogue created by interpersonal metaphors is directly related to the social distance between the speaker and the addressee.

Iedema (1997) is probably one of the few empirical studies that investigated the social distance between the writer and the addressee and the resulting differences in metaphorical realization. Specifically, Iedema examined the ways in which ‘shouldness’ (directives or commands) is realized in bureaucratic-administrative settings, in order to provide a typology of the linguistic resources most frequently chosen in those settings. The
significant insight provided by Iedema’s empirical study was that a greater linguistic investment in directive is closely related to a higher degree of politeness. This is manifested in the comparison of the following two directives in the form of a memo:

**Directive 1**

To: Jane  
Date: Fri 7/12  
Topic: Notices – Dec

Please prepare a draft of the December Notices.

Ta.*  
John

*Ta: an Australian slang phrase meaning “thank you”

**Directive 2**

To: Barbara and Shane  
Date: 31 August 1993  
Topic: BTS Support Package

We need to develop BTS Support Packages for schools in 95.  
Would you prepare a proposal for us to discuss on Friday.

Ta.  
John
According to Iedema, the command presented in Directive 1 indicates a relatively large hierarchical distance rather than familiarity, due to its linguistic directiveness, although the writer’s attempt to use ‘please’ slightly mitigates the strong directive tone created by the social distance. The command presented in Directive 2, on the other hand, involves more work on the part of the writer by adding a modal metaphor ‘Would you.’ The command in Directive 2 thus suggests a relationship which requires a greater need for politeness, and therefore a smaller hierarchical distance. Another difference between Directive 1 and 2 is that Directive 1 includes a mere (although slightly mitigated) command, while Directive 2 has an additional element: ‘We need to develop BTS Support Packages for schools in 95.’ This clause provides background information to enable the addressee to carry out the command, and hence it functions as a supportive move (i.e., a reason) legitimatizing the request. In this vein, the writer of the Directive 2 does not only do more work in realizing its command, but also in setting it up as part of the text. By demonstrating these two types of directives, Iedema explains that different grammatical resources for different audiences marks different degrees of power (Directive 1 is addressed to the secretary-receptionist, while Directive 2 to two educational consultants). Importantly, Iedema highlights the circumstance in which the meaning of politeness is realized by a writer’s extra work that is represented by the choice of interpersonal metaphors. This becomes even more apparent in the following example:
Directive 3

Payroll/EMSTAFF Interface

ORIENTATION  A pre-requisite to achieving the benefits of implementing the new corporate Payroll system is to develop an interface which will automate the transfer of data from EMSTAFF to the payroll system.

LEGITIMATION  The benefit of this interface to E&M is that data will be input to the Payroll system sooner and without risk of transcription errors, resulting in more timely and more accurate payroll adjustments. The corporate benefit is that it enables the company to achieve an overall staff reduction of 18 in the processing of payroll information.

BACKGROUND  To design, test and implement the EMSTAFF interface will require approximately two man-months of effort from a Production Systems Analyst between now and the end of October, and

CONCILIATION  I am aware that Production Systems does not have the resource at present to meet all of its demands.

LEGITIMATION  Payroll replacement is one of the key information technology projects in the lead up to privatization and

COMMAND  I would be grateful for your help in facilitating Bob’s efforts to support this project.

FACILITATION  Please call me if I can provide any information on this matter.

[signed]

The command presented in Directive 3 is different from the two directives in Directives 1
and 2. Here, the writer does much more work in order not only to create the meaning of politeness but also to legitimize his or her requests. That is, the writer relies on interpersonal metaphor realized by a projecting cognitive clause “I would be grateful for...” to show a respectful attitude toward the reader. What is important here is that the command is realized not in terms of a mental process of desire, such as “want” or “ask,” but in terms of a modalized (“would”) mental process of reaction (“appreciate” and “like”). By doing so, the writer is successful in deemphasizing the meaning of command and realizing hypotheticalness (i.e., metaphorical meaning). Furthermore, the writer provides background information that legitimizes his requests as supportive moves prior to actually providing the command. Thus, in Directive 3, the essence of the command has been backgrounded not only in the clause but also at the level of text, resulting in a more polite way of commanding. This suggests that the text is written by somebody presuming lower status than the reader. Iedema explains that this type of text “is generally used by workers writing ‘up’ to higher-level officials or by higher-level officials aiming to generate a ‘collegial’ atmosphere” (Iedema, 1997, p. 80).

Of course, extra work on the part of the writer, such as relying on a projecting cognitive clause, does not always lead to creating a polite meaning. The following example shows that the writer’s metaphorical choice can contribute to far more direct tone in formulating the command:
Directive 4

COMMAND  I am writing to confirm that the painting of all Qantas vehicles should conform with those guidelines outlined in the Company’s Graphic Standards Application Manual.

LEGITIMATION  As you may be aware, the Graphic Standards Application Manual was one of the elements approved by the Board of Qantas when the company embarked on its new corporate identity program 10 years ago. It remains the standard for all applications of Qantas graphic disciplines worldwide.

LEGITIMATION  It is particularly important that our vehicles present a consistent look as they are very visible, especially in and around airports where our imagery is applied to many elements and consistency is paramount.

FACILITATION  If you wish to clarify the application of the Qantas branding to all of the vehicles, please contact our Production Coordinator Mellissa Madden and she will gladly assist you.

Regards

[signed]

Unlike Directive 3, Direct 4 starts with articulating its purpose ‘I am writing to confirm.’ This projecting clause serves as the command. The writer then provides several legitimations or reasons, not preceding the command but following it. By doing so, the command in Directive 4 is foregrounded or emphasized not only at the clause level but also at the text level. This is contrasted with Directive 3, where the writer does a lot of work
before he gets to the point and therefore signals respect for the reader. Thus, Directive 4 suggests that the writer is not concerned with mitigating the tone of the command, signaling the writer’s higher status than the reader.

Iedema’s (1997) study sheds light on the three important issues: the way in which the command is realized (direct or indirect; congruently or metaphorically), the presence of legitimizing elements supporting the command, and where the command occurs in relation to additional legitimizing elements at the level of the text. These three issues are directly related to the contextual variables of tenor; in other words, the writer’s lexicogrammatical choices are always determined by the genre demands or expectations, including who the audience is and for what purpose the text is written. Importantly, the writer is always placed somewhere along the congruent-incongruent continuum and is expected to make a maximally appropriate choice out of the several options to fulfill his or her goal, shifting to and from the metaphorized form. Iedema’s study indicates that looking at interpersonal metaphors realized by a projecting cognitive clause, such as “I would be grateful” and “I am writing to confirm,” how it is legitimized, and where they occur in a text is an important step for researchers to investigate the writer’s meaning-making choices and his or her rhetorical awareness and genre knowledge. I will refer to the framework suggested by Ideama in order to investigate the FL writers’ email-writing strategies.

In the context of email writing, which is one of the two target genres in the present study, interpersonal metaphor is clearly central as a lexicogrammatical family of resources. This is because email, unlike face-to-face oral communication, lacks pragmalinguistic cues, such as gestures, facial expressions, and a shared mental and physical context. These pragmalinguistic cues usually serve as “social lubricant” or “metamessages that convey
social meaning (i.e., relationships between and attitudes toward each other)” (Chen, 2006, p. 35). Without these pragmalinguistic cues, the metamessages via email are realized solely by how the lexicogrammatical resources are chosen, expressed, and organized by the writer. That is all the more reason why interpersonal grammatical metaphors become crucial in email communication. Thus, I will refer to the framework suggested by Ideama (1997) in order to investigate the FL writers’ email-writing strategies. I will also draw on research from the field of pragmatics because it offers complementary insights into how interpersonal relations are expressed in L2 requests (Achiba, 2003; Al-Ali & Sahawneh, 2008; Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012; Felix-Brasdefer, 2007; Takahashi, 2005; Takimoto, 2006, 2009; Trosborg, 1995).

3.5.2 Ideational grammatical metaphor

Ideational grammatical metaphors are called metaphors of transitivity, as the grammatical variation along the congruent-incongruent continuum can be analyzed in terms of the functional structure of transitivity configurations (Taverniers, 2003, see the previous section 3.2.3). The metaphorical nature of an incongruent expression of an ideational meaning can be foregrounded by comparing it to an equivalent congruent realization. Examples given by Halliday (1994) are as follows:

a. Advances in technology are speeding up the writing of business programs.

b. Advances in technology are making the writing of business programs faster.

c. Advances in technology are enabling people to write business programs faster.

d. Because technology is advancing, people are (becoming) able to write business
programs faster.

e. Because technology is getting better, people are able to write business programs faster.

According to Halliday, these five types of transitivity configurations suggest a continuum with a “least metaphorical” pole (like the sentence (e)) and a “most metaphorical” pole (like the sentence (a)). In the sentence (e), the semantic process is represented congruently as the Process (the verb, “getting better”) in the transitivity structure of the clause. However, in the sentence (a), through grammatical metaphor, the Process is nominalized (“advances”) and represented incongruently as if it were an abstract participant. What is crucial here is that relying on grammatical metaphors enables the writer to pack a number of lexical items into each clause, and the resulting text becomes more technical and abstract. This suggests that ideational grammatical metaphors can be created by means of nominalizations (Heyvaert, 2003).

Nominalization thus serves as an important resource to create more metaphorical meaning in academic and professional writing contexts. However, as Ravelli (2003) has pointed out, it is not merely having nominalizations here and there that makes a good written text but it is the management of Theme and Information structure by means of nominalizations which contributes to creating an effective written text. More specifically, the management of Theme and Information structure leads to the following two key roles played by grammatical metaphor: (1) the potential to refer and (2) the potential to expand (Halliday, 1998). In academic discourses, according to Halliday, the semiotic power of referring plays a role in making the text sound more technical, impersonal, and abstract,
whereas the semiotic power of expanding contributes to creating chains of reasoning or construing a line of logical argument leading on from one step to the next (Halliday, 1998, p. 195). These two key roles of grammatical metaphor are displayed in the following example.

She lost the opportunity to apply for the job. The loss of opportunity cost her dearly.

(Hood, 2008, p. 360)

“The loss of opportunity” in the second sentence, which is created through the nominalization of the first sentence “She lost the opportunity...,” is interpreted as grammatical metaphor. The grammatical metaphor contributes to a shift from more concrete (personal) to more abstract (impersonal) meaning by shifting its focus from an individual to an abstract process. In addition, the grammatical metaphor plays a role in creating a cohesion between sentences, leading the reader up to the next stage in the information flow.

Due to these two roles, grammatical metaphor, together with its related notions of nominalization, has been considered the main lexicogrammatical characteristics of written academic language. Halliday (1998) argues that grammatical metaphor is “one of the factors that contribute most to the overall effectiveness of a text” (Halliday, 1998, p. 203). The important role of grammatical metaphor has been supported empirically in varied academic genres: book review (Ryshina-Pankova, 2006, 2010), expository writing (Achugar & Colombi, 2008; Christie 2002; Colombi, 2002, 2006; Schleppegrell, 2001, 2006), genres across the curricular levels (Developing Multiple Literacies project at
Georgetown University’s German Department, see Byrnes, 2009; Byrnes et al., 2010; Crane, 2006; Ryshina-Pankova, 2010), laboratory reports (Schleppegrell, 2004a, 2004b), scientific essays (Hewings & North, 2008; Mohan & Beckett, 2001), picture description (Schleppegrell, 1998), and poetry analysis (Strauss, Feiz, Xiang, & Ivanova, 2006).

In the context of summary writing, which is one of the two target genres in this study, grammatical metaphor has also been identified as one of the most important resources to write an effective text. This is because grammatical metaphor is essential to transforming the source information that accomplishes generalization and abstraction in such a way that the charge of plagiarism is avoided (Drury, 1991; Hood, 2008). The significance of grammatical metaphor in summary writing seems especially crucial in terms of L2 writing pedagogy, given that L2 writer’s summarizing strategies are often characterized by text reduction or syntactic simplification, and this results in direct copying of the original text (e.g., Abashi & Akbari, 2008; Cambell, 1990; Currie, 1998; Dovey, 2010; Johns & Mayes, 1990; Keck, 2006; Kim, 2001; Pecorari, 2003, 2006; Pennycook, 1996; Shi, 2004; Wette, 2010).

To date, three major studies have investigated the relationship between the use of grammatical metaphor and effective summarization. First, Keck (2006) demonstrated that effective summaries written by L1 writers contained more nominalizations to condense information in a generalized manner (e.g., “the increase in salaries” for “raising women’s wages”) than less effective summaries written by L2 writers, which were characterized by the use of synonyms (e.g., “idea” for “notion” and “salary” for “wage”) or simple syntactic changes. Keck found that these strategies used by L1 and L2 writers also affected the overall text quality: L2 writers’ summaries showed significantly more “near copies,” while
L1 writers’ summaries showed more “moderate revisions” and “substantial revisions.” Second, Wette (2010) also found that having the ability to create generalized meaning through nominalization (e.g., superordinate terms) is more important for summarizing a text than merely having the ability to reword the original meaning (e.g., synonyms). Likewise, Baba’s (2009) study showed that having a well-structured semantic network of words (e.g., superordinate words, hyponyms and co-hyponyms) and the ability to metalinguistically manipulate these words (e.g., syntactic operation by changing grammatical structures of the source sentences) significantly affected the quality of summary writing. Baba demonstrated that creating generalized statement by means of grammatical metaphor might be the most important construct of lexical proficiency required for L2 writers to write an effective summary. The following excerpt from Baba’s study shows how grammatical metaphor helps the writer to generalize the original information of the source text.

The source sentence:
Whigs and Democrats differed not only in their attitudes toward the market but also about how active the central government should be in people’s lives.

The summarized sentence:
Democrats and Whigs also differed in their perspectives on the role of government.

The findings reported by Baba (2009), Keck (2006), and Wette (2010) indicate that good summary writers are able to perform generative operations that compress the text, and that these generative operations can be expressed by the use of grammatical metaphor, which
appears to be the key linguistic operation required for effective summarization.

The previous discussion indicates that summary writing can be interpreted as a metaphorical process of meaning-making. When summarizing the source information, writers are always expected to present themselves as objective experts that share the information in a detached, rather than involved, style (Ravelli, 2003). Unlike general academic writing, which maintains a two-way interpersonal relationship between the reader and the writer, summary writing is based on a three-way relationship: “Not only do writers have a relationship with their reader but they must also take into account their relationship with the writer of the source” (Drury, 1991, p. 436). The distances between the summarizer and the writer of the source text and between the summarizer and the reader place special demands on the language used in summary writing. That is, a summarizer of the source text, both as a reader and a writer, attempts to change texts written by another person and establish new meanings in order to make them work for new audiences in different contexts (Delaney, 2008; Spivey, 2007). Summarizing can therefore be seen as a “dialogic” process of making meaning in a specific communicative text in consideration of the reader’s needs and the purpose of the genre (Martin & White, 2005). More specifically, effective summary writing is not merely a mechanical process of reducing, eliminating, and changing words and sentences. Rather, it represents a rhetorical process: selecting information that the writer perceives appropriate for the audience and transforming the original meaning to make it accessible to the audience, by moving between various levels of meaning—from specific and concrete to general to abstract (Ryshina-Pankova, 2010).

Based on this perspective, the present study views summary writing as a metaphorical process of meaning making—constructing the original meaning in new ways
that create the appropriate level of abstraction, generalization, and technicality required for the new context. To examine students’ metaphorical process, then, this study focuses on their attempts to use grammatical metaphor in summarizing the source text.

3.5.3 Textual grammatical metaphor

The two categories of grammatical metaphor, interpersonal and ideational, have been introduced as the main focus of the present study. However, since there is a third metafunction, the textual grammatical metaphor, in SFL theory, one may wonder why this study deals with only these two metaphors. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), it is the general view that both interpersonal and ideational metaphors always have textual implications. For example, as demonstrated in the previous section, ideational metaphors have the semiotic power of expanding, which contributes to creating chains of logical reasoning (e.g., She lost the opportunity to apply for the job. *The lost of opportunity* cost her dearly). The same thing can be said for interpersonal metaphor. As discussed earlier, identifying interpersonal meanings comes from analyzing the Subject and Finite elements, and their respective order. For example, when the Subject takes place before the Finite, the MOOD is declarative, as in “*Professor Murson has given out some very detailed lecture notes during classes.*” In contrast, when the text begins with an auxiliary functioning as the Finite, the MOOD is typically interrogative, as shown in “*Has Professor Murson given out some very detailed lecture notes during classes?*” This examples shows that the shift in the Subject and the Finite elements has textual implications in that it results in the simultaneous shift from the declarative to the interrogative. For this reason, this study refrains from establishing the third category for textual grammatical metaphor, and focuses attention on
ideational and interpersonal metaphors. It should be noted, however, that it is by no means easy to decide what are ideational metaphors, what are interpersonal metaphors, and what are textual metaphors, because they are not separated constructs but are interconnected with one another. Nevertheless, this study deals with the metaphors separately for analytical purposes, because this study views the writer’s attempts to create more metaphorical and less metaphorical meanings in response to the contextual demands as a sign of their genre knowledge development.
CHAPTER 4
GENRE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT

This chapter provides a review of previous studies that investigated L2 students’ genre knowledge development, focusing on the studies undertaken within the SFL framework first, followed by those conducted within ESP perspectives.

4.1 The SFL approach

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, researchers working from the SFL perspective have been major proponents of teaching explicitly lexicogrammatical resources as a way of helping students gain access to educational discourses or genres of the kind that they might otherwise not become familiar with. Explicit teaching of genre is thus interpreted by SFL theorists and educators as providing equal opportunities for all students to read and write the genres that will allow them to participate successfully in school and in other institutions of our society. Consistent with this position, SFL studies of learners’ genre knowledge development have been motivated by the recognition that schooling involves a crucial process in which learners develop control over the types of genres that are relevant to their educational and professional needs. Thus, SFL research has sought to make explicit the ways in which language is used to realize the target genres and to expand learners’ linguistic repertoires or meaning-making choices. Table 4.1 synthesizes some of the major SFL studies that focus on second or foreign language writers’ genre knowledge and language development in educational contexts.
Table 4.1 Major SFL studies of genre knowledge development in second/foreign language educational contexts

**Cross-sectional studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mohan &amp; Beckett (2001)</td>
<td>ESL undergraduate students (N = 3)</td>
<td>Content-based ESL class at a US university, where students worked on a project on human brain</td>
<td>Presentation (including teacher’s recast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleppegrell (1998)</td>
<td>ESL 7th and 8th grade students (N = 128)</td>
<td>Science classes at five middle schools in the US</td>
<td>Picture description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleppegrell (2002)</td>
<td>ESL undergraduate students (N = 3)</td>
<td>An upper-division of Chemical Engineering course at a US university</td>
<td>Laboratory reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleppegrell (2004a)</td>
<td>ESL undergraduate students (N = 3)</td>
<td>An upper-division of Chemical Engineering course at a US university</td>
<td>Laboratory reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleppegrell (2006)</td>
<td>ESL 11th grade students (a corpus of 345 texts)</td>
<td>History class at a middle school in the US</td>
<td>Expository essays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Longitudinal studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Length of</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombi &amp; Achugar</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Spanish heritage language</td>
<td>Program at a US university</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>Lexical density, grammatical intricacy, clause-combining strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td>learners (N = 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grammatical metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achugar &amp; Colombi</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Bilingual creative writing</td>
<td>Program at a US university</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>Interpersonal meaning choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td>learners (N = 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Attitude, Engagement, and Modality, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes (2009)</td>
<td>Undergraduate students who learn German as FL</td>
<td>GUGD* in the US</td>
<td>All curricular genres</td>
<td>3-year curricular levels (Level 2, 3, and 4)</td>
<td>Syntactic development, Grammatical metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes &amp; Sinicrope</td>
<td>Undergraduate students who learn German as FL</td>
<td>GUGD in the US</td>
<td>All curricular genres</td>
<td>4-year curricular levels (Level 1, 2, 3, and 4)</td>
<td>Relative clause use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Undergraduate students who learn German as FL</td>
<td>GUGD in the US</td>
<td>All curricular genres</td>
<td>4-year curricular levels (Level 1, 2, 3, and 4)</td>
<td>Syntactic development, Grammatical metaphor, Lexical density, Grammatical intricacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie (2002)</td>
<td>ESL primary, middle, and Students’ written texts</td>
<td>Narratives, Critical</td>
<td>Across the years of</td>
<td>Thematic choices, Grammatical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
high school students were collected in several Australian schools. Literacy pieces, Opinion essays, schooling, metaphors, Nominal groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colombi (2002)</th>
<th>Undergraduate Spanish learners (bilingual students)</th>
<th>College-level Spanish composition course at a US university</th>
<th>Expository essays</th>
<th>9 months</th>
<th>Lexical density, Grammatical intricacy, Clause combining strategies, Nominalization, Grammatical metaphor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryshina-Panova (2006, 2010)</td>
<td>Undergraduate students who learn German as their FL GUGD in the US</td>
<td>Book review 3-year curricular levels (Level 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>3-year curricular levels (Level 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Lexical density, grammatical intricacy, thematic development, grammatical metaphor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* GUGD: Georgetown University’s German Department

Based primarily on analysis of students’ written samples, these studies emphasize pedagogical benefits of the SFL-based instructional treatment, suggesting that explicit analysis of and instruction on lexicogrammatical resources to realize a certain genre could result in changes in students’ meaning-making choices and the improvement of their texts. For example, in the context of a picture description task, Schleppegrell (1998) identified the grammatical difficulties that the task posed for students as well as the essential treatment that was most relevant for the successful completion of the task. Specifically, Schleppegrell argued that SFL-based analysis of writers’ grammatical choices at the three metafunctional levels was helpful: ideational (how to convey information), interpersonal (how to establish
one’s point of view), and textual (how to construct a coherence between sentences, i.e., THEME and RHEME relations). Schleppegrell then proposed that SFL analysis could provide teachers with explicit information about the grammatical resources that enable students to construct more effectively the genres in academic contexts, which could then lead to helping students to be aware of how different choices convey different meanings and eventually give them more choices about how they represent themselves as a writer.

In her more recent study, Schleppegrell (2006) also demonstrated that SFL analysis was useful to produce an effective argument in expository and persuasive compositions in that it offered tools for identifying the linguistic features for argument, such as modality and consequential connectors. The pedagogical benefits of SFL analysis of grammatical resources are also discussed by Mohan and Beckett (2001) in their study of student-teacher interaction in content-based ESL class. Specifically, the researchers examined how students described causal relations and how a teacher’s recast influenced their subsequent grammatical choices, focusing on causal conjunctions (e.g., because..., if...), cause as circumstance (e.g., due to...), and cause as process (e.g., verbs such as make). The SFL analysis revealed quite different aspects of recast sequences that a focus-on-form approach might have overlooked. That is, the SFL analysis enabled teachers to focus on meaning-related problems (i.e., whether students’ choices are scientifically more appropriate or not) rather than grammatical errors (i.e., whether students’ choices are grammatically correct or not). Mohan and Beckett found that the teacher’s meaning-oriented recasts facilitated students to use language in more scientific ways and resulted in more reliance on grammatical metaphor in the expression of causality in their use of language. The researchers suggested that the SFL framework could provide teachers
and researchers with unique constructs, tools, and insights for the study of the development of scientific discourse.

Some of the longitudinal SFL studies have empirically explored the ontogenetic trajectory of language development from more congruent to more incongruent forms and more concrete to more abstract forms of meaning-making. Importantly, these studies have revealed that such developmental trajectory is marked by the writer’s reliance on particular linguistic resources, such as grammatical metaphor, lexical density, and grammatical intricacy. As have been shown in the previous chapters, the following examples described by Halliday (1994) show the changes in linguistic resources chosen by increasing advanced writers. According to Halliday, at an earlier stage of language development, conjunctions are often used by learners to show causal relationships between clauses. At a later stage of language development, verbs that represent the causal relationship are used instead of clauses, and finally, the causal relation is nominalized by advanced learners. This example shows that as learners gain more advanced literacy, they come to be able to pack more information into each clause by choosing content words (e.g., nouns, verbs, and adjectives) instead of linking multiple clauses in longer sentences using conjunctions. As a result, lexical density (i.e., the number of content words in the text as a proportion of all the words in the texts) increased, whereas grammatical intricacy (e.g., the number of main, paratactic, and hypotactic clauses divided by the number of sentences that appear in the text) decreased.
1. 

Because technology is getting better, people are able to write business programs faster.

2. 

Because technology is advancing, people are able to write business programs faster.

3. 

Advances in technology are enabling people to write business programs faster.

4. 

Advances in technology are making the writing of business programs faster.

5. 

Advances in technology are speeding up the writing of business programs.

Christie’s (2002) study investigated various academic genres (narratives, critical literacy pieces, and opinion essays) written by L2 students from different age groups: 6, 12, 14, and 16 years old, with a focus on particular lexicogrammatical resources, including control of reference, thematic choices, nominalizations, and grammatical metaphor. Through the comparison of texts written by different age groups, Christie found that the most notable language changes involved advanced students’ capacity to employ abstractions, which were constructed mainly in the use of nominal groups and grammatical metaphors. She argued that irrespective of text type or genre differences, what is valued in the texts of advanced literacy “is the capacity to deploy language in ways that abstract away from immediate, lived experience, to build instead (...) abstractions, generalizations, and arguments about areas of life of various kinds” (p. 66). Christie then proposed that the SFL approach to language education enables teachers to teach capacity to handle these things by making incongruent and metaphorical expressions explicit to learners.

Advanced adult learners’ trajectory toward more metaphorical uses of language has been studied most actively by researchers working at the German Department of Georgetown University (GUGD). Since 1997, the GUGD has developed a genre-based
curriculum, entitled “Developing multiple literacies,” which aims to integrate the acquisition of substantive content with the acquisition of German throughout the entire four-year college program (Bynes & Sinicrope, 2008). Structurally, the curriculum proceeds through five levels—starting with recounting, narrative and story genres that focus on the congruent representation of everyday experiences (Level 1), moving gradually into genres found in the public sphere that focus on more incongruent or metaphorical construals of the world (Level 2-3), and concluding at the uppermost levels of the curriculum with genres in academic, public, professional, and institutional settings (Level 4-5) (Byrnes et al., 2006, 2010). The kinds of genres across the four-year curriculum are summarized in Table 4.2. Because of its systematically designed genre-based curriculum, the GUGD serves as a place for the fruitful investigation of L2 learners’ ontogenetic progression toward advancedness in written registers, enabling these researchers to undertake longitudinal studies that explored the relationship between learners’ genre knowledge development and their expansion of linguistic resources.
In this educational context, Ryshina-Pankova (2006) examined book reviews written by German learners from different linguistic proficiency levels (Level 3, 4, and 5). The study revealed that higher proficient students were more likely to use thematized subordinate clauses and lexically complex themes than lower proficiency students. The significant increase in the use of these two resources then resulted in texts that were characterized by grammatical intricacy. In her more recent study, Ryshina-Pankova (2010) focused on learners’ use of grammatical metaphor in their book reviews, aiming to identify how grammatical metaphors contribute to the genre’s overall quality. Her study identified that grammatical metaphor played a role in creating cohesion and coherence and constructing evaluation and argumentation, and that the contribution of grammatical metaphor to the text quality was more evident in higher proficiency students’ book reviews.
Ryshina-Pankova concluded that grammatical metaphor enabled writers to create a rhetorically successful genre by shifting the proposition from concrete to abstract, from specific to general, and from factual to evaluative.

The significant roles played by grammatical metaphor in academic genres were also identified in Byrne’s (2009) study that examined narrative tasks, journalistic reports, and public speech manuscripts written by German learners over three consecutive curricular levels (Level 2, 3, and 4). Byrnes found that as learners improved their linguistic proficiency and progressed to the next curricular level, they were more likely to rely on grammatical metaphor to create the genre, in terms of occurrence, in terms of functional variety, and in terms of accurate use. Byrnes observed that learners’ language development was characterized by “a gradual shift from specific events and sequences of events at specific times by human actors to general sequences of events in timeless settings, to cause-and-effect sequences involving abstract phenomena” (p. 63). Byrnes then concluded that to realize such meanings in academic genres, an increasingly rich and sophisticated use of grammatical metaphor is indispensable.

In the same educational context, Byrnes et al. (2010) delved further into the relationship among grammatical metaphor, genre knowledge and awareness, and syntactic complexity measured by mean length of T-unit, mean length of clause, and clauses per T-unit. The study identified that with an increase in language proficiency and genre experiences (from Level 1 to Level 4), learners produced more complex syntax, showing the shift from dynamic to synoptic styles of expression, such as the use of grammatical metaphor. The researchers then suggested that the combination of the three syntactic measures was able to predict learners’ writing performance more accurately than any single
or the two measures. Their findings offer significant insights into the relationship among genre knowledge, writing performance, and syntactic development of FL learners, which could lead to a nexus between writing and linguistic development.

Similar findings have been reported by Achugar and Colombi (2008), who investigated academic literacy development of Spanish heritage language learners. Over a nine-month period, Colombi collected all the written texts of 30 students and investigated how their language choices changed over time. The students’ texts produced at different periods of time showed a trajectory toward lexically more dense and grammatical less intricate. More precisely, the analysis revealed that the students became able to express their ideas in more abstract and objective ways that are typical of academic registers, through the use of grammatical metaphors (see also Colombi, 2002). The trajectory of language development toward more metaphorical forms was also detected in Achugar’s study on Spanish learners’ oral transcripts at formal interviews, reported in the same chapter. Achugar focused on interpersonal grammatical metaphors that could mean attitude, engagement, and modality and often appear in the “cognitive mental clause”, such as I believe that... (see the previous section, 3.5.1). A longitudinal qualitative analysis of one student’s oral transcripts showed that a year later, the student began to use an interpersonal grammatical metaphor in order to position himself and present a subjective evaluation as an authorized speaker. Achugar and Colombi’s findings highlight that learners’ shift toward more metaphorical use of language is inextricably linked not only to their academic literacy development but also to their successful participation in their new academic discourse community.

Advanced writers’ tendency to use incongruent and metaphorized forms has been
manifested through the comparison of L2 writer and native speaker performance on the
same task. Schleppegrell (2002) compared laboratory reports written by the two types of
writers, focusing on their clause combining strategies. Her analysis of the students’
laboratory reports revealed that while L2 writers used conjunctive links, such as because,
when, but, and when, L1 writers tended to rely on grammatical metaphors and noun phrases
to create cohesion between clauses. Through the comparison of L2 learner and L1 writer
performance on laboratory reports, Schleppegrell (2004a) further demonstrated that L1
writers were more likely than L2 writers to use incongruent expressions through
grammatical metaphors in ways that enable technicality, reasoning, text-structuring, and
authoritativeness. Schleppegrell argues that compared with L1 writers, L2 writers need
more explicit guidance that helps them to gain a greater awareness about linguistic
resources and their roles in constructing genres, suggesting that the SFL approach enables
L2 writing instruction to foster L2 writers’ sophisticated understanding of meaning-form
links to realize a genre.

In sum, the results of the above-mentioned empirical studies support the commonly
held SFL assumption that L2 learners tend to move on a continuum toward more
incongruent use of language, as they gain a higher-level of language proficiency. However,
it should be noted that emergence of incongruent lexicogrammatical features, such as
grammatical metaphors, are influenced not only by learners’ advancedness but also genre
differences. Byrnes and Sinicrope (2008) pointed this out succinctly in their study on
German learners’ attainment of relative clauses. Based on the analysis of the large corpus
that contained various texts written by different proficient learners, Byrnes and Sinicrope
found greater increases in frequency of relative clause use in advanced learners’ texts (i.e.,
more incongruent forms) by comparison to beginning levels. While this finding seems to support the commonly held assumption that an increasing occurrence of relative clauses is a sign of advancedness, Byrnes and Sinicrope point out that the finding might be due to possible task effects, because the tasks given to different proficient students involved quite different genres: Beginning-level students were asked to write a personal and narrative register, which often results in congruent semiosis, while the genres of the tasks in higher proficiency group contained more public genres, such as opinion-stating and argumentative essays, which often require compact thematic development and an increasingly distanced writer stance that might lead to greater use of nominalizations and therefore the likelihood of greater incidence of relative clause structure. Byrnes and Sinicrope then noted that L2 learners’ language development “would be most usefully observed not in isolation but in the context of an array of syntactic and lexicogrammatical resources whose likelihood of occurrence is genre-based, (...) and a matter of individual choice” (p. 133).

4.2 The ESP approach

While SFL studies of genre knowledge development generally aim to associate genre knowledge with an expansion of lexicogrammatical resources, ESP research into how L2 writers learn genre tends to associate their genre knowledge with their rhetorical consciousness or contextual awareness in a broader sense. More precisely, the ESP genre approaches locate genres within discourse communities where the genres’ communicative purposes are specified, such as academic disciplines or particular professions. As discussed in Chapter 2, defining genres in this vein has important implications in that it allows ESP scholars to link context and communicative purpose to genre. At the same time, defining
genres in relation to discourse communities, to some extent, also shifts the pedagogical purpose of the ESP approaches away from the more language-focused, meaning-oriented goals of the SFL approaches to a more pragmatic, acculturation-motivated pedagogy aimed at helping advanced L2 students to participate successfully in their target contexts (Hyland, 2004). As Salager-Meyer (1991) noted: “consciousness-raising about text structure” is “an important ingredient in ESP courses for writing purposes” (p. 1069).

Due to its pragmatic, acculturation-oriented approaches, ESP studies of genre knowledge development have been undertaken mostly through in-depth ethnographic observations of students’ participation in disciplinary activities (e.g., Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999; Belcher, 1994; Casanave, 1995; Leki & Carson, 1997; Spack, 1988, 1997; Tardy, 2005, 2009). Less often, some studies have focused more attention on the effect of particular instruction on writers’ rhetorical consciousness-raising (e.g., Cheng, 2007; Hyon, 2002; Sengupta, 1999). The ESP studies in this domain also draws mostly on in-depth analysis of qualitative data (e.g., interviews and discussion transcripts) and on holistic assessment of learners’ writing performance, unlike SFL studies that focus on specific linguistic features chosen by learners. The following section first presents the results of the empirical studies that focused on instructional effects. Reviews of the ethnographic studies will then follow.

4.2.1 Effects of instruction on genre acquisition

Many ESP studies undertaken in classroom-based instructional contexts have emphasized the significant role of genre analysis in helping novice L2 writers to learn new genres that are valued in their discourse community. That is, in L2 writing classroom,
teachers often use authentic texts as genre models to encourage students to analyze the communicative purposes of the target genres and to raise their awareness of the generic structure and linguistic features of the text. Table 4.3 summarizes the instructional features and findings of these ESP studies, which have been conducted in ESL and EFL settings.

It is important to note that in the ESP studies, genres are chosen based on students’ needs in relation to their academic work in their real-life situations, and the identification of students’ needs is essential to the development of the curriculum and instruction of the course. For example, Jacoby, Leech and Holten (1995) presented an ESP-based academic writing course for science-major undergraduate students at a US university, where scientific research report was singled out as a target genre on the basis of the departmental needs that the students must acquaint themselves with all or parts of scientific research report during their academic training. Each unit was designed to help students understand discourse structure and lexical and grammatical features of different sections of a research report, mainly through analysis of text samples with reference to the evaluation criteria. Of particular note is that this model-analysis activity was characterized by the use of various models produced by writers of different levels of expertise, such as professional scientists, L1 senior undergraduate biology students, and L2 classmates. The authors argue that exposing students to authentic samples produced by different levels of expertise is a valuable method for creating opportunities for students to build their own rhetorical criteria as well as for raising their consciousness of the genre conventions.
Table 4.3  Major ESP studies of genre learning in instructional contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheng (2007, 2008a, b)</td>
<td>ESL graduate students at a US university</td>
<td>Academic non-academic &amp; academic genres</td>
<td>16 weeks</td>
<td>Interviews, literacy narratives, and the genre piece written at the end of the course</td>
<td>Effects of genre analysis on students' rhetorical awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley-Evans (1995)</td>
<td>ESL graduate students</td>
<td>Common-core English class for students from various disciplines at a UK university</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>The ways in which authentic genre models were used in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowerdew (2005)</td>
<td>Chinese EFL undergraduate students</td>
<td>English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) writing course for students at a university in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Analytical reports (business reports, environmental reports, and lab reports)</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>The sequences of genre-based tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden (1998)</td>
<td>Japanese EFL doctoral students (N = 8)</td>
<td>Academic writing course at a university in Japan</td>
<td>Research articles</td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>Drafts produced in the process of completing the final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond and Macken-Harik (1999)</td>
<td>ESL high school students</td>
<td>Critical literacy course as part of biology program</td>
<td>Science papers</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>Drafts produced in the process of completing the final version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry &amp; Roseberry (1998)</td>
<td>Brunei EFL undergraduate students (N = 34)</td>
<td>Academic English course at a university in Brunei</td>
<td>Brief tourist information</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Pre-test, post-test (writing a tourist information text of 150-200 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyon (2002)</td>
<td>ESL undergraduate students (N = 11)</td>
<td>EAP course (reading &amp; vocabulary development) at a US university</td>
<td>Hard news, feature articles, textbook, research article</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>Text-description exercise, interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacoby, Leech, &amp; Holten (1995)</td>
<td>ESL undergraduate students</td>
<td>Academic writing course for science-major students at a US university</td>
<td>Research reports</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafa (1995)</td>
<td>Israeli EFL undergraduate students</td>
<td>Academic writing course</td>
<td>Term paper</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>Questionnaires, interviews, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pedagogical benefits of model analysis were also reported by Dudley-Evans (1995), who described a common-core English course for graduate students from various disciplinary backgrounds at a British university. To promote students’ understanding of communicative purposes of research articles across disciplines, the course encouraged students to analyze the patterns of organization of research articles in various disciplines through move analysis. Dudley-Evans specifically emphasized the pedagogical benefits of move analysis of research articles in different disciplines—analysis of how the same genre
is realized in different disciplines raised students’ awareness of what conventions are and are not common to various disciplines and why certain patterns of organization are and are not favored by a specific discipline. Dudley-Evans suggests that conducting move analysis in this way is an important step for novice graduate writers to understand the communicative purposes of research articles and the generic conventions of the genre within their disciplinary framework.

In a similar vein, Flowerdew (2005) described a report writing module in English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) writing course for undergraduate science students at a Hong Kong university. Various kinds of analytical reports, such as business reports, environmental reports, and lab reports, were selected as target genres based on the needs of lecturers as well as employers who expected students to gain the ability to use English for a variety of work-related purposes. Like the abovementioned genre-based courses presented by Jacoby et al. (1995) and Dudley (1995), this course also made use of authentic reports as models in order to familiarize students with the basic principles of writing a report. Specifically, students were encouraged to analyze the communicative purpose of the report, the relationship between the writer and the reader, and organizational patterns and lexicogrammatical features of the report. Flowerdew argued that students’ model analysis served as a tool for them to write their own report individually and eventually to complete successful project report in the end of the course. The group project, according to Flowerdew, allowed students to communicate with real people in a real workplace in the process of collecting data, and therefore facilitated students to pay particular attention to the audience, the purpose, and the context in which they were writing. The EOP-oriented writing course described by Flowerdew suggests that if teachers attempt to expose students
to real-world genres and carefully design task sequences toward outcomes, students might be able to go beyond classroom and begin to see genres in the real world as the means by which they can accomplish their goals, rather than merely in the fictional world that they might read and write for course requirements.

While the above studies provide an in-depth description of how genre-based modules are implemented in L2 writing classrooms, they do not provide empirical evidence to prove the effects of such instruction on students’ genre learning. The following studies, by contrast, offer some empirical evidence regarding how the instruction could contribute to the development of students’ genre knowledge. Sengupta (1999), for example, found that explicit discussion of textual features of research articles contributed to raising students’ rhetorical consciousness and changing their self-perception of reading and writing abilities. The participants were L2 Chinese undergraduate students at a Hong Kong university, who attended small-group tutorials (biweekly in the semester) planned as additional language support for regular lectures on language and society. In the tutorials, the students read the research articles related to the topic of language and society, and discussed how each writer makes their texts reader-friendly and could improve their texts. The students then kept a journal in which they wrote about what they learned as readers and writers, and the difficulties they encountered. To examine the effects of these activities on the students’ rhetorical consciousness, Sengupta analyzed transcripts from the classroom discussions, the students’ journal entries, and interview protocols. The triangulated data revealed that the students became keen on the significant role played by some signals to create reader-friendly texts, such as *We begin with...*, *We have shown that...*, *As discussed previously*, and *As mentioned in...*. The data also showed that the students tried to use these
reader-friendly features in their own writing and relied on these features to understand a gist when reading. Sengupta then argued that explicit discussion of rhetorical as well as linguistic features of texts could lead to developing students’ metalanguage to talk about texts, which could in turn develop both reading and writing abilities.

Similarly, Gosden (1998) also reported the effects of explicit analysis of authentic texts on raising students’ rhetorical awareness and developing their metalanguage. The participants were Japanese EFL doctoral students who voluntarily attended once-a-week class in Academic Writing Skills. Gosden selected an ‘introduction’ section in research article as a target genre of the course. In the course, students were encouraged to analyze propositional clusters (PCs) at local (tense, voice, modals, thematic control, connectors) and global levels (structures and moves). For the experiment, students received a section of Introduction in research article in which the order of the original propositions was randomly manipulated, and were requested to order the strips according to the perceived schemata of PCs. Gosden collected their three drafts (first, intermediate, end), and compared them to identify whether enhanced awareness of PCs helped students to organize a text. The results revealed that the drafts produced by the students demonstrated substantial improvement in terms of coherence and cohesion. Gosden argued that textual modeling of local and global rhetorical structures enabled students to verbalize what is necessary to create coherent texts, that is, to develop metalanguage to talk about their writing and their rhetorical decisions.

The effects of textual modeling on students’ rhetorical awareness have also been reported by Hammond and Macken-Horarik (1999), who traced the process in which L2 students learned rhetorical organization and the language of science papers in a 10-week
critical literacy program as part of a biology program at an Australian high school. The program was content-based and aimed to help students to learn text types used in science papers, such as explanations, reports, and procedures. Students were exposed to authentic science papers, and analyzed the functions of these different text types and linguistic features to realize the functions. In addition to rhetorical and linguistic features, some technical terms that are central to a topic of main concern in the science paper (e.g., in vitro fertilization, IVF) were also discussed so that students could learn scientific concepts. After receiving the instruction on key text types, the students were required to complete a science paper in the remaining weeks of the unit. The task required them to explain the process of IVF, write a letter to a couple who have embarked on the IVF program, and explain how the material of inheritance may be changed. Analysis of multiple drafts produced by the students showed that as the unit progressed, the students used the text types they had learned in their own texts, and incorporated linguistic resources used in the model texts into their own science papers. These rhetorical and linguistic choices in turn facilitated detailed discussions in their papers. Hammond and Macken-Horarik then suggested that explicit instruction including textual model and model-analysis activities might help students to become independent of their teacher in their analysis of texts.

Whereas the aforementioned studies assessed empirically the effects of one particular treatment without any comparison groups, some studies have compared two different genre-based approaches. Pang (2002), for example, compared a textual-analysis approach and a contextual-awareness approach in the context of teaching how to write film reviews. The participants were L2 Chinese undergraduate students enrolled in a writing course at a Hong Kong university. The contextual-approach group (N = 19) was introduced to film
review through questions that focused learner attention on contextual variables in writing, such as reasons for writing film reviews (purpose), who writes film reviews (writer role), who reads film reviews (audience) and what styles—formal, casual, or technical—are preferred in film reviews (register). The textual-awareness group (N = 20), on the other hand, analyzed film reviews through lexical, grammatical, and syntactic analyses to understand how writer attitudes are realized, how meanings are conveyed by conjunctions, how tenses are used in each rhetorical move. For both groups, the lessons lasted altogether six class hours, over three weeks. To evaluate progress, students were required to write a film review before the unit began and also at the end of the unit. The film reviews were graded holistically as well as analytically. The results showed that both groups made considerable progress and showed a very similar quality in writing performance. The results indicate that the distinction between textual and contextual approaches are not very clear-cut, and that genre is predicated on the inextricably-linked relationship between a type of text and a type of situation, as Coe (2002) noted.

To examine the effects of two different genre approaches, some studied have focused on explicit and implicit genre instruction. Such studies have consistently revealed that explicit genre-based teaching was more effective than implicit genre-based teaching. For example, Mustafa (1995) found that his participants who took a one-semester explicit genre-based writing course received much better evaluations for their term papers in the end of the semester than those who were taught the same content in implicit ways. The participants were Israel undergraduate students in an EFL course at a Jordan university. In the course, one group of students were explicitly taught the term paper conventions, including the thesis statement, the introduction-body-conclusion structure, and citation of
outside sources. The other group of students, on the other hand, were implicitly taught those items that were essential to term papers (the author did not explain directly how the implicit approach to teaching the genre was conducted). The data collected by the author included the term papers that the students wrote in their discipline classes, a questionnaire, and structured interviews. The students’ comments were analyzed for their awareness of the term paper conventions, and the results were compared to the evaluation of their term papers. The sample of the students’ term paper was analyzed to see if they actually used the conventions under investigation, such as proper placement, form, and basic content. The analysis of students’ response to the questionnaire showed that explicit instruction on term paper conventions played a role in raising their awareness of its basic conventions, and this enhanced rhetorical awareness was also apparent in their written pieces.

Evidence for an advantage of explicit genre instruction over implicit genre instruction has also been produced/reported by Henry and Roseberry (1998), who analyzed the brief tourist information written by EFL undergraduate management-major students at a Brunei university. The students were divided into an explicit group and an implicit group, and both groups received six hours of genre-based instruction over a three-week period. To examine the effects of the instruction, the students took a pretest and the same test again as a posttest three-week later. Over three weeks, the instructors in both groups used six authentic tourist information texts as models, yet the use of the authentic models differed depending on the group. The students in the explicit group were encouraged to pay attention to moves, including obligatory moves (identification, location, description of the tourist spot) and optional moves (how to get there, brief history, reasons for going to the place). Using the same authentic texts, meanwhile, the students in the implicit group
engaged in traditional language activities including cloze passages, sentence-joining exercises, and error correction exercises. The students in both groups then created two texts as a posttest. The pretest and posttest were measured in terms of a motivation index (degree of motivation to visit the place described), move structure (how well the obligatory moves were presented in the correct order), and texture index (conjunction, conjunctive reach, specificity, connectivity, topic, and topic shift). The results showed that the explicit group performed significantly better than the implicit group for motivation score and texture score, but not for move structure. Although the authors did not offer a direct explicit explanation about why no significant differences were observed for move structure, they concluded that explicit instruction on move structure enhanced students’ awareness of the generic structure of the genre, which also made it easier for students to use textual indexes, such as conjunctions.

While the studies described above focus on a specific genre that students need to learn for their disciplinary courses, other studies in instructional setting deal with multiple genres or “genre chains” (Swales, 2004), aiming to raise students’ awareness of different conventions across genres. Hyon (2002) described her reading course that dealt with four different genres (a hard news story, a feature article, a textbook, and a research article) and its effects on the improvement of students’ reading ability. The course was designed as English for Academic (EAP) courses for L2 undergraduate and graduate students as well as non-native university staff. The class met for 12 weeks for 80 minutes each week. In the course, the four genres were discussed in terms of content, structure, language style (linguistic features that convey the writer’s stance toward the text content or audience), and purpose. The tasks aimed to elicit students’ observation about each of the functions. For
example, in examining the structure of the research article genre, students were given a modified introduction of an article, and discussed what the author was doing in each of the segments. Students then worked to recreate an appropriate structural sequence. Students were also asked to find an example of the genre being studied in class outside the classroom and to describe explicitly evidence of some of the features discussed in class. To examine the effects of these tasks, Hyon gave the students a text-description exercise as the final exam and conducted interviews to learn the degree to which students raised their awareness of genres. The exams were analyzed based on whether students labeled the passages as representing particular genres, whether they described the content, structure, language style, and purpose features of the texts, whether they gave examples of these features by referring to specific segments from the texts. The results showed that almost all the students successfully named the genres and offered appropriate text descriptions and examples. Hyon observed that this might be attributed to the fact that genre features corresponded with linguistic signals similar to those discussed in class, such as hedges and quotations. The students’ comments at the interviews also supported the effectiveness of the course. Most of the students positively evaluated the course, saying that genre knowledge helped them to understand where to locate main ideas in texts, to increase reading speed, and to gain confidence and enjoyment in reading. Some of the students commented that awareness of textual features provided them with frameworks for composing their own texts. The long-term effects of such techniques on students’ reading and writing abilities have been reported in Hyon’s another study (2001): “Genre knowledge gained through explicit instruction can be remembered by EAP students over an extended period of time and facilitate aspects of L2 reading and writing” (p. 434).
Likewise, Cheng (2007, 2008a) examined student learning from genre-based writing instruction focusing on various genres, ranging from non-academic genres (such as job application letters and wedding announcements from the local newspaper) to academic genres (such as research articles). The course was designed for L2 graduate students from various disciplines. It included two 75-minute weekly sessions for 16 weeks and consisted of four interrelated sections. Section I focused on non-academic texts, where students practice delineating the macro-organization of genres in terms of moves and describe the lexicogrammatical features that characterize a move. They also engaged in an explicit analysis of the rhetorical dimensions of genre, such as the roles of reader, writer, and purpose in genre production and consumption. In Section II and III, which shifted their focus onto academic texts, students collected published research articles from journals in their fields and analyzed the move structures of different sections. In addition to these in-class tasks, students completed three major writing tasks as assignments. One of the major assignments was to write three different introductions that were based on the same materials but were tailored to three different rhetorical contexts (e.g., a conference proceedings and a conference proposal). To investigate the impact of the genre-based approach, Cheng (2008a) conducted a case study focusing on a second-year doctoral student, Fengchen. The data for analysis came from the three versions of introduction produced by Fengchen, his comments on this writing assignment, text-based interviews, and his literacy narratives. The data showed that genre analysis activities in class facilitated his “writerly engagement with texts” (Cheng, 2008a, p. 66, emphasis in the original)—Fengchen began to constantly consider the writer’s perspective at various points while reading, predicting what rhetorical choices the writer will make and comparing the
actual development of the text with his own envisioning of it. This “writerly reader” perspective also helped Fregchen to write his own texts by transferring many of the generic features he had previously analyzed into his writing. For example, he tried to use the move pattern in one of the articles he analyzed. The findings also pointed to Fregchen’s emerging “ability to recontextualize his genre awareness” (Cheng, 2008a, p. 66, emphasis in the original). That is, Fregchen tried to manipulate his introduction based on his perception of the needs of the readers. Based on the findings, Cheng (2008a) concluded that exposing inexperienced writes to different genres contribute to raising their rhetorical awareness or their writerly engagement with texts, and that the insights they gain from explicit analysis of texts might serve as a set of heuristics to enhance their own observation of the text, rather than just as a set of rules.

The benefits of genre analysis activities have also been reported by Cheng’s (2008b) documentation of another second-year doctoral student, Ling. Cheng (2008b) found that Ling’s research article introduction contained several important items that had previously been taught in class, indicating that Ling used the previously noticed rhetorical features quite consciously in her writing. Importantly, in-class genre analysis tasks helped her to perceive certain features that were unique to her field. The findings about Ling’s individual engagement with the genre provides significant insights into genre pedagogy, because, as I will present in the next section, some ESP researchers have indicated that students’ previous writing experience in writing classrooms might be an obstacle for them to learn their discipline-specific genres. Unlike these ESP scholars, Cheng (2008b) claims that genre analysis tasks in writing course might lead to “students’ meaningful re-mediation of their existing genre knowledge and their resulting new understanding of texts that is
embedded in their own learning needs” (p. 407). In all, Cheng’s research shows that genre analysis may serve as a powerful learning tool for developing novice L2 writers’ academic literacy.

4.2.2 Students’ genre learning through situated practice

As noted above, a majority of studies pertaining to genre learning have investigated how writers develop genre knowledge through situated practice, that is, through participation in workplace or disciplinary activity. Table 4.4 summarizes major studies that analyzed students’ genre learning through situated practice. Drawing most often on social theories of learning, such as situated learning, communities of practice, activity theory, or cognitive apprenticeship, these studies have explored how writers learn genre in natural, non-manipulated settings, including classrooms, research, internships, and other workplaces. These studies thus do not investigate the impact of a particular teaching technique and approach, but instead consider how writers use the various resources within their learning environments to develop genre knowledge. Interestingly, all were conducted in ESL settings. Regarding the methods, all the studies employed a qualitative case-study approach including a combination of interviews, class observations, questionnaires, logs, and written materials.

Table 4.4 Major ESP studies of genre learning through situated practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelova &amp; Razantseva (1999)</td>
<td>ESL graduate students</td>
<td>The Graduate School of A variety of writing</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>Interviews, round table discussion, observations,</td>
<td>L2 writers’ literacy experiences in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

139
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Research Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blakeslee (1997)</td>
<td>ESL graduate engineering student (N = 1)</td>
<td>Electrical engineering course at a US university</td>
<td>Research article</td>
<td>Interviews, observations of group draft review meetings, analysis of drafts and graded written assignments</td>
<td>L2 writers’ literacy experiences in their disciplinary courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leki (2003)</td>
<td>Chinese ESL nursing student (N = 1)</td>
<td>Nursing care plan</td>
<td>Interviews, a variety of writing documents (course syllabus, assignment guides, drafts and graded written assignments, etc.)</td>
<td>L2 writers’ literacy experiences, transferability of prior experiences in their disciplinary courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riazi (1997)</td>
<td>Iranian ESL doctoral students (N = 4)</td>
<td>PhD programs at a Canadian university</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>L2 writers’ literacy experiences in their disciplinary courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spack (1997)</td>
<td>Japanese ESL undergraduate student (N = 1)</td>
<td>A variety of writing assignments (e.g., argument, evaluation, review, summary)</td>
<td>Interviews, classroom observations, drafts and graded written assignments with instructors’ comments</td>
<td>L2 writers’ literacy experiences in their disciplinary courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is the issue of transferability and conflict that has been highlighted in many studies of genre learning through situated practice. A common finding has been that inexperienced L2 writers have difficulty transferring skills developed in one domain to another, mainly because, as Leki and Carson (1997) noted, “what is valued in writing for writing classes is different from what is valued in writing for academic courses” (p. 64). For example, Leki’s (2003) case study of a nursing student from China, Yang, described the difficulties encountered by the writer in completing her “nursing care plans” assigned in the nursing course. Leki’s examination of Yang’s writing experiences showed that before entering the nursing curriculum, Yang had successfully produced traditional writing assignments in her ESL, history, and sociology classes. However, the nursing care plans were quite different from traditional writing assignments (e.g., research paper) and called for a number of genre-specific conventions, such as specific medical terminology, abbreviations to note,
medications patients were receiving, and recommendations for care. Importantly, Yang had been a doctor in China before coming to the U.S. and therefore had gained a lot more content knowledge than most peers. Despite her content knowledge (i.e., what is written), she struggled to produce a complete nursing care plan due to her lack of knowledge about the genre conventions (i.e., how it is written). Leki’s study demonstrated that writing expertise may not be easily transferrable from one genre to another, and that gaining the ability to write a new genre requires writers to play a new role, even though they have discipline-specific content knowledge. Leki’s study also highlights the issue on the role that needs to be played by L2 writing practitioners, curriculum developers, and institutions to help novice L2 writers to prepare for participating in their disciplinary communities (see also Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999, for the issue of responsibility for addressing students’ writing difficulties).

Blakeslee’s (1997) case study of a multilingual student majoring in electrical engineering, Bouzida (a graduate student from Algeria), also illustrated how the student’s prior experiences with one genre conflicted with the rhetorical expectations of another genre. Bouzida had prior experiences with writing technical progress reports for his previous research project in electrical engineering, but this experience did not help him to complete a journal article that he later encountered. Blakeslee’s study suggests that writers’ “residual practices” work not only as strategies but also as obstacles. Blakeslee argues that “newcomers to a domain should be able to learn genres by encountering the purposes and conventions of the genres firsthand as well as by engaging in the social context of the domain, because genres are embedded in that context” (p. 135).

Spack’s (1997) longitudinal study tracing Yuko’s (a first-year international student
from Japan) disciplinary enculturation also highlighted the transferability issue. The study described that Yuko struggled to differentiate summary from argument in her freshman year. Spack observed that Yuko’s writing struggle was attributed to her lack of understanding of what it means to refer to published authorities and how to use sources in academic writing. Spack’s longitudinal examination of Yuko’s writing, however, revealed that by her junior year, Yuko had understood that referring to published authorities was tied to critical thinking and that using sources was important to support her own views as well as to make her argument persuasive and coherent. Spack discussed that the improvement of Yuko’s writing was mostly due to her tutors’ support (e.g., interpreting a professor’s expectations and a task requirement), feedback and comments from professors, and her extensive writing practice, including not only writing assignments but also journal entries. Spack also emphasized the importance of content knowledge to gain certain academic ways of reading and writing. Based on the results of the longitudinal study, Spack concluded that acquisition of academic literacy involves being engaged in a process of constructing content knowledge, and that genre knowledge can be facilitated only within specific contexts.

Similar to Yuko in Spack’s (1997) study, the four graduate novice writers from Angelova and Razantseva’s study (1999) also expressed difficulties in differentiating summary from argument, or in demonstrating critical thinking because of their lack of knowledge in the field. As one of the participants, Mila, commented: “Reporting and summarizing somebody’s job is OK, but to be critical—I don’t know. Our instructor wants us to be critical, but it’s impossible without enough background reading. The base of good critique is background knowledge” (p. 504). Through a nine-month ethnographic
observation of the four graduate students, however, Angelova and Razantseva found that by the end of the study, the students were able to overcome some of the problems through their active interactions with professors and peers (e.g., seeking advice from professors, consulting with peers, and asking for clarification of the task expectations) and professors’ comments and feedback on their written assignments. The authors argue that such situated practice is essential to learning to write disciplinary genres. Of particular interest is that the authors explicitly claim that professors in disciplinary courses are responsible for helping novice L2 writers become successful writers in their disciplines (see pp. 521-522 for the eight responsibilities that these authors argue should be taken by professors).

Riazi’s (1997) study of four Iranian doctoral students (Ali, Maryam, Nima, and Majid) at a Canadian university also revealed that situated practice within specific contexts is a key to gaining knowledge of disciplinary genre. Riazi found that the four students all encountered problems identifying expectations of the genre that was new to each of them: an assessment report (Nima), a research proposal (Ali, Majid), and a review of published articles (Maryam). Examining how the students coped with their tasks assigned in their disciplinary courses for a period of five months, Riazi found that they employed a variety of strategies to overcome the problems pertaining to task representation, such as social and searching strategies, namely, “their interaction with their tasks, task environments, and members of their academic community to enhance their understanding and performance of their writing tasks” (p. 133). Riazi also emphasized the importance of gaining knowledge of discourse communities, including not only domain-specific subject-matter knowledge, but also knowledge of audience expectations, discourse conventions, and important issues in a field. Riazi’s study proposes that writing expertise develops as learners acquire membership
in a specific discourse community, documenting a model of the complex and multiple interactions among writing expertise, task, context, strategies, and learning.

The studies reviewed above shed light on the importance issue—what does writing expertise mean? The findings of these studies consistently reveal that even though a writer is evaluated as having acquired expertise in one domain, this does not necessarily mean that the writer has also acquired expertise in another domain. That is, when writers are new to a particular community of practice, they may be unable to identify similarities between prior and present generic tasks, and therefore they may not be able to transfer genre knowledge they have previously developed to the present context. Somewhat contrasting findings, however, have been reported by some composition scholars, who advocate that knowledge of one genre serves as scaffolds for learning new genres. Tardy’s (2009) case study of the four graduate student writers (John, Paul, Yoshi, and Charti), for example, showed that as writers repeatedly encounter certain genres over time, they accumulate experiences and build repertoires that they can later draw upon when facing new genres. Tardy described that when writing cover letters, the four writers recognized the similarities with the statements of purpose that they had written when applying to graduate school, and applied the textual features of the statements of purpose to the cover letter. Similarly, Tardy found that Paul drew on his knowledge of research articles when writing his master’s thesis, and that Yoshi drew on his knowledge of project reports he had written in his workplace when writing his course project reports. Tardy argues that it is important for novice writers to reencounter similar genres repeatedly, because their accumulated experiences make the relevant generic and discursive features become automatic or tacit, which enables writers to begin to attend to new features other than form, gradually forming more complex and
contingent understandings of genre. Thus, Tardy’s study provides a different perspective in defining a writing expertise: Previous experience and prior genre knowledge are not an impediment but a help. Tardy’s study indicates that accumulating experiences with writing linked genres and understanding genre networks might be a key to gaining writing expertise. Tardy’s study also provides significant insights into developing L2 writing curriculum: Rather than focusing on a single core genre, it would be more beneficial to intersperse some other linked genres into tasks and materials in order to fully develop students’ ability to analyze rhetorical situations and to build advanced literacy enough to be transferrable to various rhetorical situations.

Tardy’s (2009) also offers an important insight into the role of situated practice for learning expertise in new domains. Echoing authors like Leki (2003) and Spack (1997), Tardy also emphasized that disciplinary classrooms—those in which the major aim is to teach disciplinary content—provide writers with somewhat different learning opportunities than writing classrooms and is an important ingredient of genre learning. Disciplinary classrooms in general allow learners to have access to a variety of resources that may be essential to genre learning: mentoring and oral interactions, repeated writing practice, scaffolded participation in disciplinary activity, intensive textual interaction. Tardy claims that these kinds of disciplinary resources are extremely valuable in building knowledge of content, process, rhetorical, and formal knowledge, all of which contribute to building genre knowledge. Based on this claim, Tardy offered a model that seeks to explain dimensions of genre knowledge: In this model, “genre knowledge cannot exist separately from formal, process, rhetorical, or subject-matter knowledge; instead, it is a confluence of these four dimensions” (Tardy, 2009, p. 20, italics in original).
Findings from these ESP studies offer two significant insights into genre knowledge development. First, they consistently demonstrate that genre is inextricably linked to the discourse community where it is used; however, there is not a single discourse community with unified standards and expectations but rather every specific discourse community has its own conventions, values, and practices. Therefore, as Casanave (1995) put it, in studying writers’ genre learning, researchers should consider not the global factors of the discourse community but the immediate, local, and interactive factors that touch students’ lives directly in the process of constructing the writing context. Second, genre knowledge is not monolithic but instead consists of multiple dimensions, such as subject-matter knowledge, and rhetorical and formal knowledge, as suggested by Tardy (2009). Importantly, these dimensions might be developed quite differently, which indicates that writing expertise develops through the interactions among these multiple dimensions of genre knowledge. These insights suggest that in conducting research in ESP or EAP contexts, it would be necessary to trace individual writers longitudinally and to explore if or how they transfer genre knowledge gained through instruction to their own practice in the discourse community to which they belong.

4.3 Summary of the review and unexplored issues

The review presented in this chapter shows that scholars from SFL and ESP schools have employed fairly different approaches to research into genre learning, as they differ in their theoretical frameworks, their educational settings, their focus, and their use of genre in the classroom. SFL studies have focused mainly on expanding linguistic repertoires of novice writers who learn to write in language classrooms, and have therefore used students’
written documents as a main source of data for analyzing the ontogenetic changes of student writers. ESP-based studies, on the other hand, have focused primarily on writers’ longitudinal processes of acculturation into the discourse communities of their chosen disciplines, and have therefore employed in-depth ethnographic case-study approaches, including analysis of triangulated qualitative data sources, such as interviews, classroom observations, and diary logs. Even when the ESP studies explored some textual features of students’ writing, their interests resided not so much in lexicogrammatical features (i.e., micro-level features) as in discourse structures or moves (i.e., macro-level features). Longitudinal case studies or ethnographies used in these ESP-based studies appear to offer strong methods for understanding complex social interactions among learners, their prior experience, and their conflict with expectations of a new genre, but these methods are rarely used in SFL-based studies.

Such different approaches and research designs have naturally yielded different kinds of research findings. Most of the SFL studies have concluded that as students gain advanced linguistic proficiency, they expand their linguistic repertoires in ways that enable them to make maximally appropriate situated choices, marking the trajectory from their reliance on congruent forms of expression toward their increasingly competent command of more metaphorical and incongruent forms. SFL scholars have then argued that this shift is due to their increasingly keener awareness of the relationship among genre, social context, and linguistic resources, which can be raised through SFL-informed tasks and materials. Meanwhile, the findings from ESP studies focus not so much on students’ language choices as their consciousness raising about communicative purposes of each genre, which can be achieved through their accumulating situated practices and experiences. Thus, although
both SFL and ESP studies have commonly claimed that writing development occurs in conjunction with genre knowledge development, they see the dimensions of genre knowledge that writers can develop in different ways. The distinction is crucial because it suggests a real difficulty in comparing the results obtained from the two environments.

One question arises here: What does writers’ *development* exactly mean? More specifically, as Cheng (2006) noted: When we say that learning or development takes place on the L2 writer’s part, does this mean that the writer “is less a learner of language and writing and more a learner of genre?” or “can these three constructs—language, writing, and genre—be separated at all?” (p. 82). This insight is crucial, given that most L2 studies on genre learning have paid little attention to how learners’ writing development is related to their language development and how these two types of development can be mediated by enhanced genre awareness among learners. It can thus be argued that it is necessary to investigate how different dimensions of genre knowledge interact with one another in the process of writing development (e.g., how students’ consciousness-raising about communicative purposes of a genre influences their language choices), rather than looking at either of these dimensions separately (e.g., how students’ language choices change as a result of a certain treatment). Research in genre learning can therefore benefit from more mixed method approaches to inquiry (Tardy, 2006), such as collaboration between SFL and ESP approaches. That is to say, qualitative changes in writers’ development (often studied by ESP scholars) can be complemented with quantitative changes in writers’ texts (often studied by SFL scholars), and this combination in turn offers powerful insights into writers’ knowledge changes over time. These integrated approaches appear to be essential, given that genre knowledge is not monolithic but instead consists of multiple dimensions (Tardy,
Another issue needing further inquiry is concerned with task design. Although there is general agreement between SFL and ESP scholars that student writers can benefit from genre-based tasks (i.e., those facilitating explicit attention to the relationship of writing to particular contexts) and that genre should form part of any writing curriculum, some investigators inadequately describe the syllabi, materials and tasks, and goals of their genre-based classrooms. In other words, it appears that studies on genre-based pedagogies tend to overlook questions about what learners learn, how they learn it, and whether the necessary learning takes place when they accomplish a genre-based course given for a certain period of time. L2 writers develop their writing competence mainly through schooling or education; therefore, if research aims to offer instructional recommendations, it is necessary to clarify what the syllabus of the course looks like, how the instruction is implemented, what kinds of tasks are designed and given to the students in each unit, and how these tasks are related to the goals of the genre-based instruction.

Finally, the review of previous literature highlights another unexplored issue: genre learning in East-Asian EFL contexts. There is a general tendency for SFL studies to be conducted in ESL settings or in FL settings in English-speaking contexts, that is where a foreign language other than English is learned by English L1 speakers. The ESP studies, on the other hand, have been carried out most often in ESL settings and only occasionally in EFL settings. All in all, for both SFL and ESP most of the empirical studies reviewed above have been based primarily on advanced second/foreign language writers, many of whom learn to write in graduate-level courses in American universities. Although Hydi Byrnes and her colleagues at GUGD explore various levels of FL writers, their studies deal
with students who learn to write in German. However, the research evidence and pedagogical recommendations based on such a homogeneous group may not be applicable to different groups of learners, for example, undergraduate-level EFL writers who are doubly challenged by both their limited linguistic resources and their lack of familiarity with the genres and registers expected in English discourses. L2 writing researchers have addressed that many features of EFL writing contexts are distinct from those in ESL settings, and EFL writers’ idiosyncrasy has recently arisen as a crucial area needing further investigation (e.g., Manchón, 2009; Ortega, 2009, 2010; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2009; Schoonen, Snellings, Stevenson, & van Gelderen, 2009). These scholars have noted that instructional recommendations for ESL contexts may not be applicable to EFL settings because of several idiosyncratic features of FL writers. For example, Ortega (2009) described EFL writers as having fewer prospects to use writing beyond the confines of the classroom or in their immediate future, which might lead to their lower motivation to write in EFL. Further, Manchón (2009, 2011) pointed out the instructional role that writing can play in the acquisition of EFL, emphasizing that a large number of EFL writers write to learn (the language) rather than learning to write (the content).

Considering the issues noted above, it is important to investigate the consequences of introducing genre into writing curricula in East Asian EFL contexts. It is expected that the findings will not only help develop writing curricula that can meet various contextual needs in East Asian countries but also can increase “the capacity of L2 writing as a field to produce theoretically robust knowledge that can be useful in improving L2 writing across different settings” (Ortega, 2004, p. 8).
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHOD

Given the unexplored issues outlined in the previous section (see 4.3), the present study aimed to document ontogenetic, longitudinal development of Japanese undergraduate EFL students as they progressed through a two-course sequence of genre-based writing course instruction that aimed (a) to help them become good at writing specific genres (emails and summarization) in English and also (b) to help them develop more sophisticated knowledge of genres in general. Specifically, the present study concentrated on the two areas of inquiry, namely, (1) ontogenetic changes in individual writers’ rhetorical awareness, overall quality of writing performance, and lexicogrammatical choices and (2) comparisons of the changes across writers from two different proficiency levels.

As discussed in the previous chapters, genre knowledge development ought to be understood as multidimensional, including declarative, procedural, social, rhetorical, disciplinary, and linguistic (Tardy, 2006, 2009). Therefore, the match and mismatch of L2 writers’ genre-informed rhetorical awareness, their actual genre production and meaning-making choices need to be explored in order to understand their ontogenetic development as L2 writers. However, L2 studies on genre learning to date have been characterized by traditional sub-disciplinary boundaries between SFL and ESP schools, and as a result, dimensions of genre knowledge that a single study focused on have been limited, and thus the term “development” has been interpreted in different ways by different authors. In order to explore as many aspects of genre knowledge as possible within a single study, I
used a mixed method approach (Kamberelis & Bovino, 1999) that allowed me to investigate both qualitative and quantitative changes within individual EFL writers, including changes in their beliefs and awareness about specific genres and genres in general as well as the overall quality of the written texts they produced at different periods of time, and their lexicogrammatical choices to make meaning in a given rhetorical context. To this end, individual writers’ engagement with and benefits from the genre-based and task-based instructional design were traced during one academic year by collecting triangulated longitudinal data through questionnaires, interviews with 8 focal students, reflection papers (free writing), and written documents produced at the beginning and the end of the course.

Individual writers’ longitudinal changes were then compared between two different proficiency levels in order to investigate the extent to which and how proficiency may have modulated these EFL writers’ ability to use and benefit from the systematically-designed genre based tasks and materials. To the best of my knowledge, little attention has been paid to the relationship between linguistic proficiency and rhetorical awareness in previous L2 studies on genre learning. Furthermore, as have been shown in the previous chapter, studies on L2 writers’ genre learning have focused mainly on advanced-level ESL graduate writers and have insufficiently investigated EFL writers, who can be expected to exhibit lower levels of L2 proficiency than ESL writers. Given that many features of EFL writing contexts are distinct from ESL settings (Manchón, 2009; Ortega, 2009, 2010; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2009; Schoonen et al., 2009), EFL writers’ genre learning is considered to be a crucial area needing further investigation. The present study therefore aimed to examine how genres were learned by EFL writers, whose language proficiency level was likely lower than those represented in most previous genre-instruction studies, and who varied
among them in proficiency as well, since the institution had deemed that they needed to 
undergo the same instructional EFL writing curriculum tracked into a higher and a lower 
linguistic ability level, based on their prior experiences and an institutional placement test. 

Of main interest was to ascertain how and to what extent genre-based tasks and 
materials helped both linguistic ability groups to become better writers over time.

5.1 Research questions

5.1.1 Longitudinal changes of individual EFL writers

Three research questions were formulated regarding the longitudinal changes within 
individual EFL writers.

Research Question One: How does the rhetorical awareness and genre knowledge of 
undergraduate EFL writers, as reflected in interviews, questionnaires, classroom 
free writes, and so on, change over time as they engage in systematically 
designed, genre-based tasks and materials?

When students are presented with new writing situations, they may resort to the internalized 
expectations and demands of former teachers or experiences with prior text types or tasks in 
order to respond to this ‘newness’ (Kramsch, 2000; Roca de Larios, Manchón, & Murphy, 
2006; Russel, 1997). However, drawing on the conventions shaped by their previous 
experiences may not always be helpful in a new writing context since their previous 
knowledge may need reinventing to respond to the new context and the immediate situation 
of the genre (Bartholomae, 1985). This is especially the case for undergraduate students
who are making the transition from high school genres to college genres, as Kobayashi and Rinnert (2008) have shown for the Japanese EFL context. These researchers found out that the Japanese student groups who had not been explicitly taught academic writing in either L1 (Japanese) or FL (English) at senior high school tended to rely upon their earlier writing training in elementary and junior high schools, which focused on sakubun—expressive writing based on personal feelings and thoughts. Consequently, the student writers investigated by Kobayashi and Rinnert tended to misapply textual features of sakubun to their argumentative essays in both L1 and L2. Kobayashi and Rinnert’s study shows that writers’ schemas are affected by both prior knowledge and the immediate situation, and hence they should be encouraged to assess the immediate context to decide how their schemas must be revised for the new texts that are to be produced (Johns, 2008). An important goal of the genre-based approach is to provide students with the framework to do this and to prepare students to participate in, and respond to the “newness.” Thus, the research question presented here aimed to identify: (a) what the students bring to a new genre in terms of experience, exposure, practice, or prior knowledge, (b) how their prior expectations and beliefs are challenged by some of the new things learned in genre-based materials and tasks, and what problems they encounter, and (c) what they learn over time.

Research Question Two: How does the overall writing performance of undergraduate EFL writers change over time as they engage in systematically designed, genre-based tasks and materials, as measured on their pre- and post-instruction writing performance in terms of holistic scores of their writing by human raters, the fluency of their written production, and the syntactic complexity of their texts?
In order to investigate whether the changes in the writers’ rhetorical awareness and genre knowledge are reflected in their actual writing performance, it was necessary to examine whether any improvement can be observed in the overall quality of their textual products written at the beginning and the end of each course in the two-course sequence. The relationship between writers’ genre-appropriate rhetorical awareness and the overall quality of their texts corresponds to the one between declarative knowledge (i.e., knowledge about something) and procedural knowledge (i.e., knowledge carried out in the practice of doing something). According to Berkenkotter, Huckin, and Ackerman (1988), declarative knowledge is shaped earlier than procedural knowledge, suggesting that the procedural knowledge can be derived from the declarative knowledge. The research question presented here thus aimed to examine whether and how the enhanced genre-appropriate rhetorical awareness can contribute to more sophisticated realization or production of the genre. To answer this research question, the present study provided the students with pre-instructional baseline writing task and post-instruction writing task (emails written at the beginning of and the end of the spring semester; summaries written at the beginning of and the end of the fall semester). Their baseline and end-of-instruction writing performances were then compared and analyzed on the following three variables: holistic scores, fluency, and syntactic complexity.

In terms of holistic scores, and since different genres and writing tasks were selected for each semester (email-writing task for the spring semester; summary-writing task for the fall semester), different scoring criteria for assessing the quality of the written products were utilized. The email writing for the spring semester was holistically rated based on a
five-point scale on the e-mail writing task scoring guideline for the TOEIC test (see Appendix A); on the other hand, the summary writing for the fall semester was holistically scored on a five-point scale with reference to the integrated reading and writing task scoring guideline for the TOEFL-iBT (see Appendix B). Changes in fluency in students’ writing, on the other hand, were investigated following Byrnes et al. (2010) in terms of raw frequencies reflecting the total amount of words that the students complied into full syntactic structures (i.e., total number of words, T-units, and clauses). Finally, changes in complexity in students’ texts were investigated in terms of the syntactic structures that the students created (i.e., mean length of T-unit [MLTU], mean length of clause [MLC], and clauses per T-unit [CTU]).

Research Question Three: For undergraduate EFL writers, how do the lexicogrammatical choices of making meaning in a given rhetorical situation change over time as they engage in systematically designed, genre-based tasks and materials, as indexed by lexical density and interpersonal grammatical metaphor use on pre- and post-instruction email writing and by lexical density, attempted paraphrase, and use of ideational grammatical metaphor on pre- and post-instruction summary writing?

Besides the overall writing quality of the students’ textual products reported in Research Question Two, it was also necessary to investigate how their lexicogrammatical choices to make within a specific rhetorical situation change from beginning to end of the course in order to know whether the changes in the students’ rhetorical awareness affected their
meaning-making choices. To this end, their lexicogrammatical choices on two occasions (i.e., pre-instruction and post-instruction) were compared and analyzed in terms of the degree of lexical/grammatical richness.

Lexical/grammatical richness was measured as follows. For the email-writing, the following two variables were analyzed: lexical density and interpersonal grammatical metaphor. As for the summary-writing, a focus was placed on the following three variables: lexical density, attempted paraphrase, and ideational grammatical metaphor. These variables were analyzed as a manifestation of the students’ longitudinal lexicogrammatical development.

Lexical density provides a measure of the proportion of lexical items (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs) relative to function words. Since lexical words are the words which primarily convey information, a text is considered “dense” if it contains many lexical words relative to the total number of words (i.e., lexical and functional words) (Laufer & Nation, 1995). Lexical density was obtained from the L2 lexical complexity analyzer (available at http://aihaiyang.com/synlex/lexical/).

Grammatical richness is a measure of the proportion of more sophisticated, incongruent, metaphorized resources utilized by the students in their texts. It was calculated as a frequency count of grammatical metaphors. In the email writing (request emails), I focused on interpersonal grammatical metaphor (see 3.5.1 in Chapter 3), namely, grammatically mitigated request forms (Eggin, 1994, Iedema, 1997): interrogative (Would it be possible to...? Could you...) and If-clause (I was wondering if..., I would appreciate it if..., and I would be grateful if...) (see also Achiba, 2003; Al-Ali & Sahawneh, 2008; Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012; Felix-Brasdefer, 2007; Takahashi, 2001, 2005; Takimoto,
These interpersonal metaphors serve as social lubricants in email communication between the sender and the recipient, as Chen (2006) noted. In the summary writing, on the other hand, I focused on ideational grammatical metaphor (see 3.5.2 in Chapter 3), namely, nominalized expressions that condense the source information into the summarized text. In SFL studies, the use of ideational grammatical metaphor has been found to be a key to creating effective summary, as it enables the reduction, generalization, and integration of information from the source in a way that avoids plagiarism (see Drury, 1991; Hood, 2008 for the role of ideational grammatical metaphor in summary writing). This study therefore investigated whether the students began to use ideational grammatical metaphor as a generative operation for their summary as they progressed through the genre-based writing course, and if they did, how they used grammatical metaphor in their attempts to paraphrase the source information.

Gauging “grammatical” richness in terms of use of grammatical metaphor that is indentified by tallying certain expressions, as it has been explained above, may in fact be seen to overlap with traditional counts of lexical resources and assessment of word richness that are commonly done in literature on vocabulary knowledge (e.g., Daller, van Hout, & Treffers-Dakker, 2003; Johansoon, 2008; Laufer & Nation, 1995; Read, 2000; Vermeer, 2000). However, the theoretical intent of the present analyses of grammatical richness as indexed by grammatical metaphor is distinctly motivated in SFL, whereby meaning is posited to be construed in the grammar or in the phenomena in which lexical and grammatical meanings interact with each other (Halliday, 1994).
Comparisons of longitudinal changes in two proficiency levels

In order to delve into how and to what degree genre-based tasks and materials contribute to longitudinal development of individual EFL writers, this study examined and compared the benefits of the same instruction on students at two different proficiency levels, who learned the same genres in the same instructional context. The two proficiency levels were institutionally defined based on their performances on the in-school placement test. Undergraduate students at this university where this study was conducted had been placed into one of the seven classes. Among the students who participated in this study (N = 30), half of them were from the upper-proficiency track, while the other half from the lower proficiency track. Both of the two intact classes were taught by myself as the teacher-researcher, over two consecutive semesters during the students’ sophomore years (second year in college). The following three research questions were formulated regarding the relationship between their longitudinal changes and the English proficiency levels of the students.

*Research Question Four:* How does the developmental process of gaining rhetorical awareness and genre knowledge through genre instruction (i.e., as investigated in RQ1) differ between the two different proficiency levels?

As discussed in *Research Question One,* inexperienced L2 undergraduate writers often face difficulty transferring genre knowledge developed in one domain to another. However, transferability itself does not appear to be exclusively a language issue; rather, it appears to be influenced by their previous experience with or exposure to genres similar to or linked to
current tasks or genres that they encounter (see Cumming, 1989; Cumming, Rebuffot, & Ledwell, 1989; Hall, 1990; Jones & Tetroe, 1987; Manchon, Roca de Larios, & Murphy, 2009; Pennington & So, 1993; Roca de Larios, Manchon, & Murphy, 2006, 2008; Uzawa, 1996; Whalen & Menard, 1995; Zamel, 1983, for some aspects of composing competence that could be transferred to L2 writing). This assumption indicates that L2 writers, whether their language proficiency levels are advanced or less-advanced, might be able to benefit from explicit use of model texts to build genre knowledge, and that textual interactions might serve a valuable role for students at both levels. The research question presented here aimed to ascertain the hypothesis regarding the relationship between language proficiency levels and genre learning at the level of awareness and production.

Research Question Five: Do any patterns uncovered for pre/post-instruction changes in overall writing performance (i.e., as investigated in RQ2) differ between the two different proficiency levels?

As discussed in Research Question Two, the previous L2 research suggested that declarative knowledge is shaped earlier than procedural knowledge and that procedural knowledge is more difficult to build and is influenced more by language proficiency levels as well as prior experiences (Berkenkotter et al., 1988). This indicates that less-proficient language learners are more likely to encounter problems than advanced learners in terms of actual writing performances, and that it might be more challenging for the lower proficiency group to make the transfer of the declarative knowledge to the procedural knowledge take place. Thus, even if the students can raise their genre awareness through
explicit instruction, it can be assumed that some variations might still be observed between different proficiency groups in terms of how successfully they can choose genre-appropriate language resources and produce the genre in a maximally appropriate way. Based on this assumption, the overall quality of textual products written by the students at the two different proficiency levels were compared cross-sectionally on the three variables noted in Research Question Three: holistic scores, fluency, and complexity.

Research Question Six: Do any patterns uncovered for pre/post-instruction changes in lexicogrammatical choices (i.e., as investigated in RQ3) differ between the two different proficiency levels?

As discussed in Chapter 3 (see particularly 3.2.4), increased exposure to and explicit analysis of genres may help FL writers to capture more global, larger generic properties of the genre (i.e., developing genre awareness). However, this does not necessarily mean that they are able to choose appropriate language resources to realize the genre (developing rhetorical awareness) from various meaning-making options available. The difficulty in meaning-making choices might be much more evident in students at lower proficiency levels. To explore this issue, lexicogrammatical choices by the students at the two different proficiency levels were compared cross-sectionally in terms of the degree of lexical/grammatical richness. As explained in Research Question Three, lexical/grammatical richness was measured via lexical density and interpersonal grammatical metaphor (for email writing) and via lexical density, attempted paraphrase, and ideational grammatical metaphor (for summary writing)
5.2 Method

This study was framed as a longitudinal study of two intact classes of 15 Japanese undergraduate students each, one among the upper-proficiency and one among the lower-proficiency track in the institution, unfolding in a naturally occurring instructional situation over one academic year of genre-based EFL writing instruction in their sophomore-year college studies. The reason to use the methodology of a longitudinal study was to carefully document how learning to write was mediated by students’ understanding of and interaction with genres that take place in various rhetorical contexts. The goal of this study was to document transformations in Japanese EFL writers’ rhetorical awareness, their writing performances, and their lexicogrammatical choices as they progressed through the two-semester sequence of genre-based English writing courses that aimed (a) to help them become good at writing specific genres (email and summarization) in English and also (b) to help them develop more sophisticated knowledge of genre in general.

In order to gain in-depth insight into students’ ontogenetic development and longitudinal change, this study employed triangulated inquiry, by gathering naturalistic data and using a variety of techniques—questionnaires, interviews, free writing, teacher-researcher field notes, and students’ writing products for the course. It was expected that this triangulation in the process of interpretation of data as well as in the collection of them would contribute to yielding a thicker description and increased credibility or validity (Harklau, 2008).
5.2.1  Context of the study

This study was conducted in a two-semester sequence of a genre-based writing syllabus offered in the sophomore year of the undergraduate curriculum at a Japanese science university. I was the instructor of the course. At this university, undergraduate students, all of whom majored in biology-related fields, such as Biotherapy and Animal Husbandry, had a compulsory English curriculum that spanned their freshman (Year 1) and sophomore (Year 2) years. This means that the students were required to complete a compulsory two-semester English course sequence by the end of Year 1 and another one by the end of Year 2 (i.e., four courses in total), after which they did not study any more English unless they took elective English courses. The outline of the compulsory English curriculum for Year 1 and Year 2 is summarized in Table 5.1. This study followed Year 2 students who enrolled in ENG 201 in their first semester and ENG 202 in their second semester in 2010 academic year. They did not take any other English class besides ENG 201 and ENG 202 during the two semesters. Each semester was 15 weeks long, and the class met once a week for 1.5 hours over the course of 15 weeks (22.5 hours per semester).

Table 5.1  The outline of the four-semester English language curriculum at the university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Focused activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>1st semester (Spring)</td>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>English Grammar in Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>2nd semester (Fall)</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>Speaking and Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>1st semester (Spring)</td>
<td>ENG 201</td>
<td>Writing for Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2nd semester (Fall)</td>
<td>ENG 202</td>
<td>Writing and Reading for Academic Purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding a general guideline of the compulsory English curriculum at this
In this university, instructors were allowed freedom to design syllabus as long as its focus is placed on writing-for-communication activities for ENG 201 and on EAP-oriented reading-writing integrated activities for ENG 202. Based on this general guideline, I designed syllabi so as to deliver genre instruction focusing on non-academic genres (using email writing as a core genre) for ENG 201 and academic genres (using summary writing as a core genre) for ENG 202. The selection of the two types of genres was based on the task-based linguistic needs analysis I conducted (see Appendix E), which will be explained in more detail in 5.2.3.

5.2.1.1 Participants

The participants (N = 30) were Year 2 students who enrolled in two intact classes of ENG 201 in their first semester and ENG 202 in their second semester in 2010 academic year. They had studied English for at least seven years by the time this study began. Half of the participants came from a higher proficiency track (N = 15) and the other half from a lower proficiency track (N = 15). The next section explains how the two proficiency levels were defined in the present study.

5.2.1.2 Proficiency levels

At this university, all entering freshmen in the beginning of Year 1 and all new sophomores in the beginning of Year 2 take the in-school placement test in early April. There are two objectives for implementing the placement test. First, since all the students at this university major in biology-related fields (e.g., Biotherapy, Animal Husbandry, Agriculture, etc.) and therefore have varying backgrounds and experiences of English
language, teachers needed to assess their English proficiency levels so that they can be placed in a class where they are able to study at the appropriate level. The other important aim of the placement test is to assess whether the students have reached the level of knowledge and skill required of college after completing six year high-school English education, which is specified in the national guideline (i.e., the Courses of Study determined by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) in Japan). During the admission process, some students are exempted from taking an entrance exam including English language test, if they are able to demonstrate sufficient biological knowledge and relevant practical experiences during an entrance interview. This admission system further contributes to widening the range of the students’ English proficiency levels within the institution. Thus, the in-school placement test was created by a team of instructors with reference to the Grade 2 of the EIKEN test, which is used by the MEXT as a benchmark for high school graduates (The Society for Testing English Proficiency Levels (STEP), 2012). Placement of the 30 participants in this study into the higher and the lower proficiency track of Year 2 of English, therefore, was also based on this test.

Following the EIKEN test format, the placement test consists of the three sections: listening (comprehension based on monologues (5 items) and dialogues (10 items)); grammar (sentence completion (15 items)); and reading (comprehension based on two passages (10 items)). The total test score was based on all 40 questions. Appendix C provides the test questions contained in the placement test implemented in April 2010, which the participants took. Table 5.2 summarizes the results of the placement test and the two groups’ general proficiency levels.
Based on the test scores, the students that year were assigned to seven different classes: from Level A (the highest track) to Level G (the lowest track). The higher proficiency group in this study included the students who had been assigned to Level A (ranging from 35-39 points in the placement test), while the lower proficiency group included those who had been assigned to Level E (ranging from 15-18 points in the placement test). According to the students’ self-reporting of certain standardized test scores, their English proficiency levels corresponded roughly to TOEIC scores, ranging 500-570 (which correspond roughly to 470-487 for TOEFL-PBT) for the higher proficiency group and 400-440 (which correspond roughly to 430-450 for TOEFL-PBT) for the lower proficiency group.

Table 5.2 The two groups’ proficiency levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Higher group</th>
<th>Lower group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course levels a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement test scores b</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported TOEIC score</td>
<td>500-570</td>
<td>400-440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding TOEFL score</td>
<td>470-487</td>
<td>430-450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Based on placement test scores, see next row.

b Based on performances on an EIKEN-like institutional test out of a possible total of 40.

5.2.1.3 Literacy background

In order to learn about the students’ prior writing experiences, a background questionnaire was administered to both groups on April 12, 2010, the first day of their first semester. Appendix D shows the questionnaire distributed to the students. The results
revealed that irrespective of their proficiency levels, these students’ FL writing experience had been limited to writing for translation or grammar practice, and few students had substantial experience with writing more than one paragraph in English. Interestingly, the questionnaire revealed that this was also true of their L1 writing experience, echoing the findings reported by Kobayashi and Rinnert’s (2002) nationwide survey of Japanese students’ literacy experience. Overall, therefore, the students were judged as inexperienced writers in both L1 and FL due to the limited previous experience and the small amount of formal writing instruction they had received. It is important to note here, therefore, that these students started off different in linguistic proficiency but every similar in previous L1 and L2 writing experiences.

5.2.3 Needs analysis and choice of the two genres: Email and summary

Based on the notion of TBLT, I started with a needs analysis for genre selection, in order to identify what genres or what linguistic resources might help the students to achieve their future goals within and beyond school. To this end, I conducted a survey of the faculty teaching discipline classes (N = 25) and a sample of students whose grade ranged from Year 2 to Year 4 (N = 224). Appendix E provides the questions for the needs analysis.

Findings of the survey revealed the two major needs addressed by both students and professors: one is English for academic purposes (EAP), and the other is English for occupational purposes (EOP). With regard to EAP, both students and disciplinary professors expected the English program to deal with basic academic genres so that students can prepare themselves to complete a range of academic assignments required in their chosen laboratory in their junior years (students at this university declare their major
and enter each laboratory when they become juniors), including reading research articles, writing a summary of the article and a presentation manuscript. Regarding the needs related to EOP, the students showed interest in gaining the ability to write emails for business purposes in light of the fact that email has become a crucial business communication tool in many Japanese companies. The needs to gain email-writing skills were also addressed by the disciplinary professors, many of whom showed concern over their students’ limited textual communication skills, not only in English but also in Japanese. One of the faculty interestingly commented: “Students prefer to use short text messaging via a cell phone, and their familiarity with such informal writing adversely affects the way they write in a formal situation. I therefore desire language teachers to train students to use formal language.”

Taking these results into consideration, I chose email writing as a core genre to focus on for English 201 and summary writing as a target genre of English 202 (cf. Table 5.1). In addition to these two specific genres, however, I strove to intersperse some other linked genres in order to develop students’ more sophisticated knowledge of genre in general. For example, in English 201, the students were exposed to an online job advertisement and were asked to write an application email in response to the advertisement. The students were also shown a hotel brochure and were asked to write a reservation email to the hotel. Likewise, in English 202, the students were asked to analyze an abstract of a research article to examine how the thesis of the research is summarized. Newspaper articles were also used for text analysis so as to facilitate students’ understanding of how the long information is condensed for readers to clearly understand the gist. In this way, several linked genres were interspersed into the syllabus so that students can understand genre chains and genre network (Hyland, 2007; Tardy, 2009)—how genres are related to or
different from each other.

It should be recognized, however, that the labels of the two target genres—emailing writing and summary writing—are not parallel to each other in terms of the level of abstraction. Whereas “summarizing” can nicely fit into the SFL definition of genre in that it represents a social action being pursued by writers to achieve a specific outcome, more than entailing a specific kind of social action “emailing” entails an “interpersonal communication medium” (Chen, 2006, p. 35, emphasis added) “through which many different social goals (field), including expressing gratitude, making a request, and applying for a job, can be generated and achieved through written dialogue (mode) in response to a particular audience (tenor)” (Yasuda, 2011, p. 113). Thus, it should be clarified that in this study, the label “email” is used as an umbrella term to indicate various genres, such as “thank-you email” “request email,” and “inquiry email.”

5.2.4 Data sources

To address the research questions presented above, I collected the following five sets of data: questionnaires, interviews, free writing, teacher-researcher field notes, and actual writing produced at different periods over two semesters. Data collected by questionnaires, interviews, free writing and field notes were first analyzed to examine changes in students’ beliefs about, perceptions of, and awareness of writing genres in FL. Following the genre awareness analysis, the students’ writing products were analyzed to examine whether and how their beliefs, perceptions, and awareness are reflected in their actual writing products, in terms of overall performance, and in their lexicogrammatical choices to make meaning in a given rhetorical context, in terms of genre-appropriate lexical and grammatical richness.
The data sources that were collected to answer each of the research questions are summarized in Table 5.3.

**Table 5.3 Data collection for answering each research question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Instrument &amp; Sample</th>
<th>Data type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To answer research questions 1 and 4.</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>- [Beginning of the semester] Questions about students’ past L1/L2 writing experience (amount and types of writing and of writing instruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- [End of the semester] Questions about their perceptions of their development as FL writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To answer research questions 1 and 4.</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Discussion with each focal student (N=8) about his or her perceived strengths and weaknesses of writing genres in FL, his or her needs for the area of FL writing, and self-assessment of his or her own development as a FL writer as a result of the genre-based writing instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To answer research question 1 and 4.</td>
<td>Free writing</td>
<td>Questions about how students interpret what they have learned, how they experience tasks and materials, and how they challenge and resolve unfamiliar concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To triangulate research questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.</td>
<td>Teacher-researcher field notes</td>
<td>Teacher’s reflection on her class, students’ response, and their longitudinal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To answer research questions 2, 3, 5, and 6.</td>
<td>Pre-instructional baseline writing task &amp; Post-instructional</td>
<td>Analytical ratings and textual analyses of students’ writing samples before and after the instruction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A request email written at the beginning of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing task</td>
<td>the spring 2010 semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A request email written at the end of</td>
<td>- A request email written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the spring 2010 semester</td>
<td>at the end of the spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A summary written at the beginning of</td>
<td>2010 semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the fall 2010 semester</td>
<td>- A summary written at the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A summary written at the end of the fall</td>
<td>end of the fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4.1 Questionnaires

Questionnaires are widely used in L2 writing research for collecting large amounts of data about people’s views and experiences of writing (Hyland, 2003b). Liebman (1992), for instance, used a questionnaire to identify the genres their Arabic and Japanese students experienced in their L1 writing instruction in their home country prior to studying in the US. Liebman found that, while Arabic students reported more experience with transactional writing, related to genres intended to inform, advise, or persuade the reader, Japanese students had greater experience with expressive writing, related to genres intended to express one’s thoughts and feeling. Similarly, Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002) conducted a large-scale nationwide questionnaire survey to explore Japanese high school students’ L1 literacy background. Their questionnaires were distributed to both students (N = 389) and L1 Japanese teachers (N = 66) throughout the nation. The results revealed that in Japanese L1 classroom, more focus was on reading for comprehension than writing, and that Japanese high school students had received little writing instruction in formal settings but tended to have intensive L1 writing training for college entrance examinations outside L1 Japanese classes called kokugo.

As seen in the studies by Liebman (1992) and Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002), questionnaires are particularly useful not only for exploring students’ past writing
experiences, attitudes and expectations but also for identifying issues that lead to the development of a needs-based, learner-based curriculum and syllabus. Thus, questionnaires were administered in my study on three occasions over one academic year: at the beginning of the semester mainly to obtain the students’ literacy background, at the end of the spring semester and the end of the fall semester in order to investigate how their initial perceptions of, attitudes toward, and beliefs about learning and writing genres in FL changed over time. The questionnaires were administered in the students’ L1, Japanese.

The questionnaire administered at the beginning of the spring semester focused on what the students had been doing about L2 and L1 writing previously—in elementary school and high school, both formally (in the official curriculum) and informally (through private schools, cram schools, tutoring, and pre-university training for the college entrance examinations outside of regular classes called kokugo). Appendix D provides the questionnaire distributed to the individual students at the beginning of the semester. The questions were developed based on Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002) (about L1 writing experience) and Sasaki and Hirose (1996) (about L2 writing) because the items that these researchers used have considerable relevance to the focus of this study. I included both L1 and L2 writing experiences as constructs of the questionnaire to investigate transferability of writing competence across languages. Previous L2 writing literature has shown that L1 writing experiences influence L2 writers’ rhetorical decisions (Hirose, 2003, 2006; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008; Kubota, 1997, 1998; Uysal, 2008), their L2 writing processes (Hall, 1990; Jones & Tetroe, 1987; Manchon et al., 2009; Roca de Larios et al., 2001, 2006, 2008; Whalen & Menard, 1995), and the quality of their L2 writing product (Cumming, 1989; Cumming et al., 1989; Pennington & So, 1993; Uzawa, 1996). However, there is
little literature on Japanese EFL students’ L1 literacy background, at least published in English, other than Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002). Therefore, it is an important contribution to reveal what kinds of L1 writing Japanese EFL students experienced or did not experience prior to entering the college, and more importantly, to what extent they experience “generally known” genres and concepts of writing in Japanese, such as sakubun, syooronbun, and dokusyokansoobun. This insight seems important given that Kobayashi and Rinnert’s (2002) study was conducted in 1999, and the participants in my study who enter the university in 2009 may have very different writing experience and different beliefs about writing.

The translated version of the questionnaire carried out at the end of the spring/fall semester is provided in Appendix M. The semester-end questionnaire aimed to identify the students’ perceptions of their own development as FL writers of the genres. Three major self-assessment questions were asked: (1) “Did you have prior experience of writing emails/summaries in English before taking this class?” (2) “Compared with the beginning of the semester, to what extent do you think that you have improved your ability to write emails/summaries in English?” and (3) “Compared with the beginning of the semester, to what extent do you think that you have changed your way of thinking about writing emails/summaries in English?” The last question was created based on Sasaki (2004), who investigated the impact of study abroad experience on Japanese EFL writers’ development. Each of the three questions was provided with a 4-point Likert scale: not at all, a little, somewhat, and a lot. The 4-point scale questions were chosen rather than 5-point scales because in odd-number scales students sometimes tend to answer with a neutral non-position opinion, such as 3 for moderate, and thus even number options are effective in
making those students express a definite opinion (Brown, 2001).

Besides these three rating scale questions, an open-ended question was provided in order to collect students’ accounts of why and how they think they have changed in the way they did. The open-ended question was used to supplement the third question: “To the students who chose either of a little, somewhat, or a lot in the third question, how and why do you think you have changed in the way you did?” Although the students’ views and opinions in respond to this kind of question may be subjective, such data would complement the quantitative analysis of the students’ writing products.

### 5.2.4.2 Interviews with 8 focal students

Interviews with student writers have been employed by a number of genre-oriented composition scholars to explore changes of students’ genre awareness (e.g., Cheng, 2007, 2008a, 2008b, 2009; Gentill, 2005; Hyon, 2001, 2002; Mustafa, 1995; Tardy, 2005, 2009). For instance, Tardy (2009) used oral interviews with four graduate student writers in an attempt to better understand the nature of genre knowledge and how it changes over time. In order to access both declarative (the conscious knowledge that the writer can describe) and procedural knowledge (the more tacitly held knowledge to actually perform some task), Tardy integrated the interview data into other data sources, including the writers’ texts, texts the writers drew upon, observations, and fields notes of their writing class sessions. The data triangulation of this kind seems to be extremely important, considering that some knowledge, even if it is explicit, may not always be successfully performed by learners, and that some knowledge, even if it is implicit, could manifest itself in learners’ writing products. Thus, interviews have great potentials that strengthen the data about students’
genre knowledge development.

In this study, I organized interviews with the students at some key points over two semesters—at the end of the spring semester and at the end of the fall semester—in order to identify how and to what degree they have benefited from the genre-based tasks, what they have learned over time, what problems they have encountered, and how their prior expectations and beliefs have been challenged by some of the new things learned in the genre-based materials and tasks. Since it was not easy to interview all the students who participated in this study, a limited number of students (N = 8) were selected randomly from the participants who had signed the agreement to cooperate with interviews: Keiko, Eri, Yuka, and Ryuichi (from the higher proficiency group), Sayuri, Mizuho, Nae, and Yoshi (from the lower proficiency group), I interviewed them individually about their perceptions of their development and their experience in the genre-based writing tasks. During the interview, I showed each student the two texts that they had written on two occasions for the pre-instructional baseline task and the post-instructional task and then asked them questions as to why they chose particular lexicogrammatical resources or rhetorical strategies, whether and how they thought their writing processes or strategies had changed, and how successful the genre-based writing class was in helping them develop their rhetorical awareness, lexicogrammatical repertoires, and writing ability. The purpose of the interview was to examine students’ thinking behind their actual writing performance. The students offered their accounts in Japanese. Their accounts were recorded and subsequently transcribed for analysis. The transcripts were analyzed with reference to other data sources they had provided.

To elicit students’ honest voices, I explained to them clearly that their opinions
would be used to improve my subsequent classes and never influence their grade. I organized interviews after their grades were turned in to avoid any possible unconscious impact that the students’ comments and behaviors at the interviews could exert on the way I evaluate them.

5.2.4.3 Free writing

The theoretical underpinnings of free writing is based on Peter Elbow’s developmental model of writing, which views writing as a process of learning and growing during which thinking is stimulated, enhanced, and expressed (Elbow, 1973). In general, free writing refers to the act of writing quickly for a set time from five to ten minutes, just putting down whatever is in the mind without pausing and worrying about what words to use, and without going back to modify what has been written (Murray, 1985). Free writing has been tried and adopted in a wide spectrum of educational contexts. Previous research has reported the use of free writing as a useful learning and instructional tool for varied purposes: self-expression and discovery (Collins, 1990), developing metacognitive awareness (Hinkle & Hinkle, 1990), improving lecture comprehension (Soldner, 1997), and enhancing awareness of academic writing conventions (Li, 2007). Li’s study on the use of “focused free writing” (i.e., giving students a specific prompt closely related to the topics covered in class) in an intensive grammar and writing course for college students seems to be most relevant to the present study. In the writing course, Li provided a ten minute focused free writing exercise at the start of each class. On Day One and Two, for instance, the class discussed the salient features of academic writing and brainstormed what makes a good academic essay. On Day Three, students did a focused free writing exercise
responding to the writing prompt “Good academic writing is not/does not...”. In this vein, clear instructions were given to provide some useful hints to direct students’ focus on using the writing prompt to freewrite. Through the analysis of students’ freewriting, Li found that the use of focused free writing gave students an opportunity to explore and reflect upon their understanding of the fundamental nature of academic writing and what academic writing entails, and improved their self-confidence in writing.

Li’s study indicates that free writing might be a valuable method to investigate the efforts students made to understand genres as well as the struggles and difficulties they encountered in their writing experiences. I thus used free writing exercise, more specifically, “focused free writing” in Li’s sense, to examine to what extent and how students’ beliefs about genres and writing changed over two semesters. Following Li’s procedures, I provided students with clear written instructions on an A4 sheet of paper, with a written prompt in the form of either a sentence, e.g., “In my opinion, a good email is...”, “To make my email convincing to the receiver, I...”, or a question, e.g., “What was easy for you in writing a summary? What was difficult?”, “What do you feel you have pretty well mastered about writing a summary? What do you feel you have not yet mastered?”, “Was there anything confusing or frustrating about the unit on discussions? If so, what?” (Jacoby et al., 1995).

I provided a five-minute focused free writing exercise at the beginning of class as a wrap-up reflection of topics covered in a previous class. I did some free writing anonymously so that students could feel less apprehensive, and some with their names so that students could feel accountable. I chose such flexible ways of free writing because making it varied but a familiar activity in this way might be a key to students enjoying it
(Ortega, personal communication, December 2008). I collected students’ free writing samples and kept them in a file for later analysis.

5.2.4.4 Teacher-researcher field notes

While the introspective methods, such as a questionnaire and free-writing, provide reports of what students say what they think and do, they do not offer any actual evidence of it. Direct observation methods attempt to bridge this gap by systematic documentation and reflection of participants engaged in writing and learning to write (Hyland, 2003b). Documentation of participant observation consists of fields notes recorded in field notebooks. Fields notes are a record of what researchers observed—an account of events, how students behaved and reacted, what was said in the classroom interaction, and all other details and observations necessary to make the story of the participant observation experience complete (Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest, & Namey, 2008). For example, Yi (2007) used field notes in her in-depth case study of a generation 1.5 Korean elementary school student’s composing practice beyond school. Yi conducted an interview once a week at the participant’s home for four months, observed the participant’s behaviors and comments, and recorded what was observed. The field note triangulated with the interviews and a participant literacy autobiography identified the kinds of composing activities the student engaged in outside classroom and her attitude toward composing activities as well as her own writing. Similarly, McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007) employed field notes to examine freshman students’ reactions to a task-based EFL course in Thailand. The researcher’s field notes included her observation of the task-based classes, her reactions to the teaching materials, and her informal conversations with students. Based on the data
coming from the field notes and other in-depth data, such as interviews, task evaluation, and learning notebooks, the authors found that the task-based syllabus had been challenged by the traditional approach, and that students had required more explicit support and guidance to carry out the task successfully.

As shown by McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007), the results of previous studies have proposed that data obtained through participants observation recorded in field notes help researchers to keep track of observable phenomena and striking occurrences which may enrich the qualitative analyses. It is hoped that such rich, in-depth naturalistic data can offer insights into social contexts in which participants exist, the relationship among and between participants, contexts, ideas, and events, and participants’ behaviors and activities.

Thus, in order to triangulate the research questions in this study, I documented students/classroom observation data in as much detail as possible as both a teacher and a researcher. To make the field notes rich, qualitative, and reliable data, I took great care of the documentation process by including a basic set of categories in which I recorded my observations (i.e., a set of questions that I consistently responded to), in addition to anything else I was commenting on. The set of questions was as follows: (1) How did the students respond to rhetorical questions at the three metafunction variables (ideational, interpersonal, and textual)? What did they say in class discussion? (2) What were new to the students in writing a genre? (3) What were easy or difficult for the students in writing a genre?

5.2.4.5 Analysis of students’ writing samples

Last but not least, a major source of data for writing research was writing itself: the
use of texts written by the learner in question, seeking to discover how s/he uses language in specific rhetorical contexts (Hyland, 2003b). Analysis of sample student essay or exam writing can help identify student use of particular forms or the assumptions underlying different choices. In Cheng’s (2007) case study, for example, three major writing tasks the focal student completed in one-semester genre-based writing course were collected and analyzed in terms of whether the student was able to transfer some previously learned features of research articles into his subsequent writing. The analysis of his three writing tasks revealed that the student used move structures learned in previous classes in his subsequent writing task, and more importantly, he elaborated on these generic moves to respond to the needs and expectations of different audiences.

Cheng’s (2007) study suggests that comparing multiple samples produced at different points of time is obviously strong data to investigate writers’ longitudinal development. Therefore, to examine how students’ language choices and their writing changed over one academic year as they experienced the genre-based course, I collected writing tasks that the students produced at four different points of time: at the beginning of the spring semester (a pre-instruction writing task designed to investigate their baseline competence of email writing) and fifteen weeks later at the end of the spring semester (a post-instruction writing task designed to investigate their competence of email writing after exposure to one-semester genre-based instruction) and the beginning of the fall semester (a pre-instruction writing task designed to investigate their baseline competence of summary writing) and fifteen weeks later at the end of the fall semester (a post-instruction writing task designed to investigate their competence of summary writing after exposure to one-semester genre-based instruction). The students had a practice session as a rehearsal
before they engaged in their baseline task. Table 5.4 summarizes a timeline for implementing the baseline and end-of-instruction writing tasks.

Table 5.4 Timeline for writing tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 / Spring 2010</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Email writing for self-introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 / Spring 2010</td>
<td>Pre-instructional genre writing</td>
<td>Email writing for making a request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 16 / Spring 2010</td>
<td>Post-instructional genre writing</td>
<td>Email writing for making a request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 / Fall 2010</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Summary writing about a short article they read in class: “Disappearance of Wildlife”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 / Fall 2010</td>
<td>Pre-instructional genre writing</td>
<td>Summary writing about an article they read in class: “The Uses of Genetics”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 16 / Fall 2010</td>
<td>Post-instructional genre writing</td>
<td>Summary writing about an article they read in class: “Biotechnology &amp; Genetic Engineering”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections describe how email-writing and summary-writing tasks were designed and how the students’ emails and summaries were assessed and analyzed.

5.2.4.5.1 Analysis of email writing

In order to examine how students’ actual writing performance changed over time, the emails written by the students at the different periods were assessed and analyzed focusing on the overall writing quality and their lexicogrammatical choices to make meaning in a given rhetorical context.
5.2.4.5.1.1 Pre-instructional and post-instructional writing tasks

In order to make the two email tasks produced at different points of time comparable with each other, the complexity level of the task was kept constant by asking students to write emails for the same functional goal, “making a request,” on both occasions. The prompts were as follows.

Prompt 1: Welcome to ABC University (students’ university in the original prompt)! You might want us to improve several things about the school, for example, school facilities, cafeteria, and bookstore, etc. Please write an email and tell us your requests. You must make at least two requests. (An email from the ABC University Improvement Committee)

Prompt 2: Welcome to Atsugi City! You might want us to improve several things about the city, for example, the city’s environment, entertainment, and public transportation, etc. Please write an email and tell us your requests. You must make at least two requests. (An email from the Atsugi City Improvement Committee)

These prompts were devised based on the “respond to a written request” type of questions on the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) writing test (see Education Testing Service, 2010; Trew, 2006). In this part of the TOEIC test, students are given an email to read and respond to, and they are asked to explain a problem and make a request on the basis of the information they read in an email by “using suitable language depending on who they are writing” and “using the common words and phrases for making polite requests” (Trew, 2006, p. 178). These remarks suggest that understanding the context and making appropriate language choices are the keys to success in the email-writing task.
However, writers’ understanding of the context does not necessarily facilitate their ability to make the lexical and grammatical choices that are appropriate for a given task. This observation is especially apparent in the “making request” type of task, because past research on L2 learners’ requestive strategies, which has been examined primarily in the field of interlanguage pragmatics, has shown that lower proficiency learners tend to use mono-clausal, direct request forms (e.g., Please...) when bi-clausal, indirect request forms are more appropriate (e.g., I wonder if you could...) (see Achiba, 2003; Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012; Felix-Brasdefer, 2007; Takahashi, 2005; Takimoto, 2006, 2009). Given these findings, examining changes in learners’ linguistic choices in one or more of the request situations should provide insights into the extent to which they are aware of the social context and are able to use pragmatically appropriate expressions that are related to the interpersonal grammatical metaphors (Iedema, 1997). For these reasons, I decided to use the request email in the context under investigation. For these reasons, I decided to use the request email in the context under investigation.

The order of the two tasks was counterbalanced by time of administration to level out any possible prompt effects on what and how they are writing. Half of the students were assigned to write emails for Prompt 1 and then Prompt 2, and the other half wrote in reverse order (Prompt 2 then Prompt 1).

Each of the pre-instructional and post-instructional writing sessions were conducted during a regular class (Week 2 for the pre-instructional baseline task; Week 16 for the post-instructional task). I asked the students to finish the writing task within the allotted class time (90 minutes), but told them they could take more time if they needed it (Sasaki, 2004). In the end, some of the students took longer to finish, but most of them finished
writing within 90 minutes. The students were not allowed to use dictionaries.

5.2.4.5.1.2 Textual analysis

Table 5.5 presents a summary of the measures used in assessing and analyzing the email writing.

Table 5.5 Measures used in assessing and analyzing the email writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall writing quality</th>
<th>Holistic scores (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Task appropriacy (tone, register, audience awareness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cohesion and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grammatical control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>• Total number of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total number of T-units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total number of clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>• Mean length of T-unit (MLTU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mean length of clause (MLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clauses per T-unit (CTU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexicogrammatical choices</th>
<th>Lexical/grammatical richness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lexical density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• interpersonal grammatical metaphors, (i.e., metaphorical forms of making requests, together with supportive moves)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4.5.1.3 Holistic score and rating procedures

All of the email samples were rated blindly by two experienced EFL instructors who had not been informed of the purpose of the research, the students involved in the research, or what point in the course the data was collected. In order to keep the raters unaware of
which topic was written first, the emails samples were mingled with no indication of when they had been written.

As explained earlier, the emails were rated using a five-point scale (1=lowest; 5=highest) based on the “respond to a written request” scoring guidelines on the TOEIC, which focused on the three major constructs affecting the overall quality: task appropriacy (tone, register, and audience awareness), cohesion and organization, and grammatical control. The scale descriptor is provided in Appendix A. I chose the TOEIC scoring guideline because it offered genre-specific criteria that were developed specifically for the assessment of email-writing task. I investigated the holistic score given to each sample as a manifestation of the writer’s understanding of the genre, lexicogrammatical repertoires available, and the ability to choose optimally appropriate linguistic resources from various options in order to meet the needs of a given sociorhetorical context.

Several days before the rating session, a packet was distributed to the two raters. The packet contained a copy of the prompt, the rating scale, and the benchmark scripts collected from the TOEIC writing test samples (Trew, 2006). The raters were encouraged to familiarize themselves with the materials before the training session.

On the day of the rater training session, each rater was given a copy of the two prompt topics used for this study and the email samples selected from students’ emails collected for a pilot study. A wide range of proficiency, from low to advanced, was represented in the samples. Then, the raters and I discussed what was meant by each scale in this institutional context in order to familiarize ourselves with certain features of each scale and establish a shared criteria. The raters were then given another ten email samples and asked to rate each of the samples. After that, each rater announced his or her ratings,
which was followed by a discussion if there are any disagreements. The rater training session was conducted in this way, and it took two hours.

After the training session, each rater was asked to rate a total of 60 emails (30 students * Times 1 and 2) written by the students who participated in this study. The emails were rated independently by the two raters. The raters were asked to submit the rated emails to me within a week from the training session. Once I collected all the rated emails, I compared the ratings to determine whether they were in agreement and to evaluate the amount of acceptable variability. As a result, the interrater correlation (Pearson correlation coefficient) for the holistic was 0.88, and I judged that this correlation coefficient was acceptable for this study. I then used an average of the two raters’ scores as my final score for each piece of writing.

5.2.4.5.1.4 Fluency and complexity

Since the global measures like holistic ratings may not sufficiently investigate L2 performance and development (Ortega, 2003), a more fine-grained analysis was undertaken to explore students’ writing performances at different points of time. More specifically, I investigated the changes in writing fluency and complexity as a manifestation of the improvement of the overall writing quality of the students’ texts that might have been impacted by carefully designed genre-based tasks and materials. Following Byrnes et al. (2010), writing fluency was measured by total number of words, total number of T-units, and total number of clauses, while writing complexity was measured by mean length of T-units (MLTU), mean length of clause (MLC), and clause per T-unit (CTU). Fluency and complexity were calculated using the L2 syntactic complexity analyzer, a free online

5.2.4.5.1.5 Lexical/grammatical richness

Besides the overall writing quality, I also investigated the changes in lexical and grammatical richness in the students’ emails as a manifestation of their lexicogrammatical development that might have been enhanced by the carefully designed genre-based tasks and materials. Lexical and grammatical richness was measured by lexical density and interpersonal grammatical metaphor. What each variable means and how it was calculated will be explained below.

Lexical density provides a measure of the proportion of lexical items (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs). Since lexical words are the word which primarily convey information, a text is considered ‘dense’ if it contains many lexical words relative to the total number of words (i.e., lexical and functional words) (Laufer & Nation, 1995). Lexical density was obtained from the L2 lexical complexity analyzer (available at http://aihaiyang.com/synlex/lexical/).

Interpersonal grammatical metaphors were defined as more marked, metaphorical, and incongruent expressions to make requests—interpersonal lexicogrammatical resources for mitigating the strength of a request (Takimoto, 2006, 2009). The target metaphorical expressions are summarized in Appendix F. They were selected based on the previous literature on requestive strategies in the field of SFL (Eggins, 1994; Iedema, 1997) and also in the field of interlanguage pragmatism (Achiba, 2003; Al-Ali & Sahawneh, 2008; Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012; Felix-Brasdefer, 2007; Takahashi, 2005; Takimoto, 2006,
Table 5.6 presents the categories of students’ requestive strategies examined in this study. It has been shown that in real-life interactive communication, the more distant the relationship between interlocutors, the more likely it is for the interlocutors to make a request politely and indirectly, and the more familiarity between the participants, the more direct a request will be (Felix-Brasdefer, 2007). However, past research on learners’ requestive strategies has shown that lower proficiency students tend to use unmitigated direct request expressions with lexical phrasal forms (e.g., please...) when mitigated indirect request forms with syntactic devices are more appropriate (e.g., I was wondering if ...). Following these findings, I defined interpersonal grammatical metaphors for making requests as syntactically mitigated request forms: interrogative (Would it be possible to...? Could you...) and If-clause (I was wondering if..., I would appreciate it if..., and I would be grateful if ...). To investigate changes in the students’ language choices from the beginning and the end of the course, I also focused on unmarked, less metaphorical, and congruent requestive expressions: imperatives (please...), obligation statement (you have to...), illocutionary verb (I am writing to request...), and want-based strategies (I need/want to... and I want you to...).
Table 5.6  Requestive strategies employed by the students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of sophistication</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Could you ...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(more metaphorical,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Would it be possible to... ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal expressions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you think that it would be possible...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If-clause</td>
<td>I was wondering if...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would be grateful if...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would appreciate it if...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>Please...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>You have to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illocutionary</td>
<td>I am writing to request...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>I would like to request...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Want-based</td>
<td>I want you to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>statement</td>
<td>I hope you will...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted here that accuracy was not included as an independent analytical variable for the analysis. Unlike studies from SLA perspectives, SFL approaches generally do not focus on the infelicities (‘errors’) characteristics of learners’ language use. Schleppegrell (2006) addresses the two limitations in having errors in focus. First, error is a natural part of L2 development, and a focus on error can be counterproductive in drawing attention to formal features that may not be crucial to meaning-making while at the same time ignoring language that may be formally correct but ineffective in constructing a genre.
Second, a primary focus on error can discourage students from attempting more complex writing patterns. Following the SFL perspectives on errors, I decided to put more focus on the strengths FL writers brought to their writing task and additional linguistic resources that they developed to write more effectively, rather than focusing on discrete errors in isolation. For example, the linguistic resources that contained an error but were considered as additional resources that the student had developed were used as the data, unless their choices hindered comprehension, as in the following examples.

*I want you to make the facilities be available to students for free.*

*I want you to increase a number of seats in the cafeteria.*

*Do you think that it would be possible for you to be permitted students coming to school by car?*

### 5.2.4.5.1.6 Supportive moves

The students’ emails were more closely analyzed with a focus on external modification that included supportive moves that either preceded or followed a request head act in order to mitigate or emphasize the force of actual request. Previous literature has found that although there is to be a fair amount of variation, request acts are generally realized by some set of generic structural moves shared by the user of the genre. For example, Felix-Brasdefer (2007) identified three moves frequently employed by the students to attenuate the requests: preparators, grounders (i.e., reasons or explanations) and promises of reward. Al-Ali (2008) offered more detailed component moves that consisted of nine strategies: opening, identifying self, apologizing, requesting, referring to documents,
promoting contribution, specifying means of further communication, ending politely, and closing. (i.e., preparators, reasons, and grounders). With reference to these researchers’ findings, I investigated what kinds of supportive moves were used by the students and how they tried to control the illocutionary force of their requests by manipulating moves. In SFL’s sense, these moves are defined as “schematic structure” (Martin, 1984) or “generic structure potential” (Halliday & Hasan, 1989) of request emails.

5.2.4.5.2 Analysis of summary writing
5.2.4.5.2.1 Pre-instructional and post-instructional writing tasks

Given that successful summary hinges on familiarity with the topic and level of difficulty of the source text, article selection must be undertaken carefully so that the two summary-writing tasks for pre-instruction and post-instruction can be compared with each other. I thus selected two texts whose topics and summarizabilities were almost the same. The summarizability of the two articles was examined from the following perspectives based on Yu (2009): readability indices (Flesch Reading Ease and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level), percentage of passivization, and lexical diversity (Malvern, et al., 2004).

The selected source texts are presented in Appendix N. The two passages of short research reports were selected from the textbook used for this class (Whitlock, Trokeloshivili, Asami, Sato, Chiba, 2007). Both texts shared a similar topic (genetics and biotechnology) and a similar underlying rhetorical structure (general-to-specific structure concluding with several discussion questions by the author). Source text 1 discussed the uses of genetics, which contained 390 words with five paragraphs. Source text 2 addressed the applications of biotechnology, which contained 423 words with five paragraphs. The
Title was eliminated from each text because it may give students a clue for the macroproposition of the source text. The order of the two articles was counterbalanced by time of task administration. That is, half the students in each group were assigned to read source text 1 and then source text 2, while the other half in each group read source text 2 before source text 1.

To eliminate the influence of the degree of text comprehension and topical familiarity on students’ summarizing performance, reading comprehension was done in class prior to the summarizing task, ensuring that a level of comprehension and familiarity with the topic among all students were neutralized to some extent. Before each of the pre-instructional and post-instructional writing sessions, the students were given either of the two source texts, along with reading comprehension worksheets, and were asked to read the texts in advance and answer the comprehension questions.

Each of the pre-instructional and post-instructional writing sessions was administered during a regular class (Week 2 for the pre-instructional baseline writing task; Week 16 for the post-instructional writing task). Although the regular class was 90-minute long, each session extended to 30 minutes, resulting in 120 minutes in total length (30 minutes for reading comprehension and 90 minutes for summarizing task). For the first 30 minutes of the session, the teacher checked the students’ answers to the comprehension quizzes and encouraged them to discuss a main topic of each article in pairs and in class. The session then shifted to the summarizing task, in which the students were asked to make judgments about what to include and how to generalize across the details in order to construct a macroproposition in their summary. The prompt for the summarization task was as follows:
Explain the main points of the article in your own words. The reader of your summary is a graduate student in the Biology Lab. She does not know what the article is about.

In this prompt, the reader and the purpose of the summary were intentionally specified in order to encourage the students to analyze the contextual demands. Assuming that the students would write in a more academic, professional, and technical manners, they were asked to write a summary for a biology graduate student (i.e., a reader who is more expert in the field than the undergrad writers) and to explain the gist of the article in the situation that the reader had not yet read the article and wanted to know what it was about.

The length of the summary was not specified because the purpose of the summarization task was to examine the students’ rhetorical decisions, including not only the kinds of lexicogrammatical resources they chose to make new meanings but also the length to which they wrote. The source text was available while the students engaged in the summarizing task. The students were allowed to use dictionaries, following the previous studies on L2 writers’ summary writing (e.g., Baba, 2009). They were asked to finish the summarization task within 90 minutes, but they could take more time, if necessary. Consequently, some of the students (N = 9) took longer to finish, ranging from 100 to 130 min, but most of them finished writing within 90 minutes.

5.2.4.5.2.2 Textual analysis

Table 5.7 presents measures used in analyzing the summaries.
Table 5.7 Measures used in assessing and analyzing the summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall writing quality</th>
<th>Holistic scores (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Task appropriacy (gist statement, supporting points, and control of information depth depending on the intended audience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cohesion and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grammatical control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>• Total number of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total number of T-units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total number of clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>• Mean length of T-unit (MLTU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mean length of clause (MLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Clauses per T-unit (CTU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicogrammatical choices</td>
<td>Lexical/grammatical richness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lexical density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attempted paraphrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ideational grammatical metaphor (i.e., nominalized expressions to condense the source information)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4.5.2.3 Holistic score and rating procedures

The summaries that the students wrote on the two occasions were holistically scored on a five-point scale (1-2-3-4-5) with reference to the integrated reading and writing task scoring guideline for the TOEFL-iBT. The guideline is provided in Appendix B. This TOEFL writing test is to write a summary of the points from the reading and lecture, where integration and generalization of the source information is the key to success (Educational Testing Service, 2005, 2008). The task requirement fits the purpose of the summary writing task for this study.
Following the TOEFL guidelines, all of the summary samples were rated blindly by two experienced EFL instructors who had not been informed of the purpose of the research, the students involved in the research, or the point in the course when the data had been collected. To keep the raters unaware of which topic was written first, the summary samples were mixed up, so that they contained no indication of when they were written. The rating procedures for summary-writing tasks were the same as those for email-writing tasks described in the previous section. After the training session, the raters independently rated a total of 60 summary samples written by the students who participated in this study. Once I collected the rated samples, I compared the ratings submitted by the two raters and calculated the interrater correlation (based on Pearson correlation coefficient). The correlation coefficient was 0.81, which I judged acceptable for this study. I then used an average of the two raters’ scores as my final score for each piece of writing.

5.2.4.5.2.4 Fluency and complexity

The holistic analyses, although useful as global assessment of summary writing performance, may not accurately and consistently examine L2 learners’ writing development. Therefore, a finer-grained analysis of specific textual features was undertaken. This analysis focused on the two constructs: raw frequencies reflecting the total amount of words that the students complied into full syntactic structures (i.e., total number of words, T-units, and clauses) and the complexity of the syntactic structures that the students created in their attempts to transform the source information (i.e., mean length of T-unit [MLTU], mean length of clause [MLC], and clauses per T-unit [CTU]).
5.2.4.5.2.5 Lexical/grammatical richness

Lexical/grammatical richness was measured by lexical density, attempted paraphrase, and ideational grammatical metaphor. With respect to lexical richness in summary writing, I did not include lexical diversity because in the context of summary writing, if the writers relied heavily on the source text, their summaries are likely to show higher lexical diversity (Baba, 2009). The results obtained from this situation may not provide a reliable reflection of the writers’ lexical development. Instead of lexical diversity, I chose lexical density for the two reasons. First, by investigating lexical density, it is possible to measure the extent of information packaging; a text with a high proportion of content words contains more information than a text with a high proportion of function words (prepositions, interjections, pronouns, conjunctions and count words) (Johansson, 2008). The degree of information packaging is considered to be an essential aspect of effective summary, in which a summarizer is expected to offer in-depth information to a reader who is unfamiliar with the topic discussed in the source text. Second, SFL theory assumes that advanced writers are more likely to produce lexically-dense texts, which characterize emerging advanced literacy (Byrnes, 2009).

The obtained values of lexical density need to be followed up by more in-depth analysis of how much of the syntax is paraphrased or transformed from the original sentences in the source text. This measurement is crucial, given L2 writers’ inappropriate textual borrowing strategies reported by many studies (e.g., Abashi & Akbari, 2008; Cambell, 1990; Currie, 1998; Dovey, 2010; Johns & Mayes, 1990; Keck, 2006; Kim, 2001; Pecorari, 2003, 2006; Pennycook, 1996; Shi, 2004; Wette, 2010). In this study, the construct of paraphrase was defined as attempted paraphrase as termed by Keck (2006):
“an instance in which a writer selects a specific excerpt of a source text and makes at least one attempt to change the language of the selected excerpt” (Keck, 2006, p. 263). The degree of attempted paraphrase that occurred in each summary was then captured in the form of the proportion of paraphrased clauses contained in individual students’ summaries between the two periods ([total number of paraphrased clauses] / [total number of clauses]).

Besides lexical density and attempted paraphrase, grammatical richness was investigated as an important aspect of effective summarization. In this summary writing context, grammatical richness was defined as the writer’s reliance on ideational grammatical metaphors to condense the source information into a summarized text (see 3.5.1 in Chapter 3). In SFL, ideational grammatical metaphor has been considered one of the most important constructs affecting the effectiveness of various written texts in the sense that everyday meanings are construed in more academic, metaphorical, and incongruent ways. The use of ideational grammatical metaphor has been found to be the key to success in the context of summary writing as well, as it enables the reduction, generalization, and integration of information from the source in a way that avoids plagiarism (Drury, 1991; Hood, 2008). This study therefore investigated whether students began to use grammatical metaphor as a generative operation for their summary as they progressed through the genre-based writing course, and if they did, how they used grammatical metaphor in their attempts to paraphrase the source information.

The coding of ideational grammatical metaphor was based on its rank shifting. Details on the coding scheme of ideational grammatical metaphor is summarized in Appendix G. The rank shift refers to the phenomenon in which “one grammatical unit functions in the place of another” (Halliday & Matthiesen, 1999, p. 259). Halliday and
Matthiesen (1999) presented the 13 types of grammatical metaphors that could result from a rank shift. Among them, the four types of grammatical metaphors that are generally referred to as nominalizations were selected for this study, since summarizing scientific contexts is “thing-“ oriented (Schlepegrell, 2004b) and the use of nominal expressions is one of the major linguistic resources contributing to the effectiveness of summary writing (Baba, 2009; Keck, 2006; Ryshina-Pankova, 2010; Wette, 2010). The four types of grammatical metaphors are summarized in Table 5.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>shift from quality to thing (e.g., The society is stable. → The stability of society)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>shift from process to thing (e.g., The driver drove the bus. → The driving of the bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>shift from circumstance to thing (e.g., The driver drove the bus very fast. → The speed at which the driver drove the bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>shift from relator to thing (e.g., The driver drove the bus very fast, and so the brake failed. → The driver’s fast driving resulted in brake failure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFL theory proposes that learners’ longitudinal development involves a movement from their frequent use of clauses toward their reliance on reduced clauses or high propositional content realized by nominal groups or grammatical metaphors. The nominalized forms in the examples of Table 5.7. can therefore serve as an effective indicator to evaluate the students’ development as FL writers.
CHAPTER 6

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN OF GENRE-BASED, TASK-BASED SYLLABUS

6.1 Syllabus design

While this study draws on the SFL-oriented genre-based pedagogy for designing various rhetorical consciousness raising activities, it also borrows ideas from task-based language teaching (TBLT) (Long & Crookes, 1993; Long & Norris, 2000; Norris, 2009; Skehan, 1996) for task selection and sequencing, and materials development for language learning. According to Norris (2009), TBLT is much more than a language teaching method, a set of innovative communicative techniques, or the kinds of clever activities that teachers have often used in their class, but instead, it covers all the elements of an entire language education program. The following elements have been suggested by Norris (2009): (1) needs analysis, (2) task selection and sequencing, (3) materials and instruction development, (4) teaching, (5) assessment, and (6) program evaluation (p. 281). Norris argues that the development of task-based language teaching programs that incorporate these elements has offered empirical evidence that “language and task abilities advance in tandem, learners achieve expectations, and language teaching evolves into a potentially more meaningful endeavor” (p. 582).

Based on these insights from TBLT, the notion of task was integrated with that of genre in designing the syllabus and in developing the pedagogy for the two-semester sequence of the FL writing courses. In other words, a set of sequenced tasks was placed within a specific sociorhetorical situation so that it can serve as a pedagogical tool for learners to become aware of linguistic resources for realizing a genre. As Swales (1990)
noted, thus, a task within a sociorhetorical situation was defined as:

“One of a set of differentiated, sequenceable goal-oriented activities drawing upon a range of cognitive and communicative procedures relatable to the acquisition of pre-genre and genre skills appropriate to a foreseen or emerging sociorhetorical situation.”. (p. 76)

In the quote from Swales (1990), “sequenceable,” “goal-oriented,” “relatable,” and “sociorhetorical situation” are key to designing the genre- and task-based syllabus. The following three theoretical principles can be drawn regarding the task-genre integration.

First, at the broadest level, tasks provide learners with specific purposes or goals for using their linguistic resources in meaningful and appropriate ways. The syllabus was designed in such a way that learners would rehearse and accomplish with as much authenticity as possible communicative task similar to those that learners might encounter in real-life sociorhetorical or instructional contexts (e.g., writing an inquiry email about the internship program; using multiple sources to write a paper). If target genres are new to FL students, they are likely to show a limited sense of the situation in which the genres occur—what forms, styles, and organizations are typically expected in authentic communications of these kinds. Therefore, a failure to specify the context of situation in which a genre unfolds might be problematic to inexperienced FL students. Thus, a sociorhetorical situation worth incorporating into the materials was established first in this study, and then writing tasks (pedagogic tasks) engaged by learners in each unit were designed so that the tasks “provide a vehicle for the presentation of appropriate target
language samples to learners,” and that “new form-function relationships in the target language are perceived by the learner as a result” (Long & Crookes, 1993, p. 39). To facilitate students’ understanding of form-function relationships in a certain sociorhetorical situation, the relatable procedures embraced “rhetorical analysis, discussion, and anticipation of audience reaction seen as a way of meeting discoursal expectations” (Swales, 1990, p. 81).

Second, task-based pedagogy consists of pedagogic tasks and target tasks (Long and Crookes, 1992). Pedagogic tasks are the ones teachers and learners utilize in their language learning classrooms. The pedagogic tasks are sequenced and graded according to their accumulating complexity. Thus, pedagogic tasks serve “as a stepping stone toward the performance of target tasks” (Van Gorp & Bogaert, 2006, p. 85).

Lastly, tasks have several phases of classroom work (Norris, 2009): (1) task input, (2) pedagogic task, (3) target task, and (4) task follow-up. According to Norris, a task input phase introduces the target task as it is realized in actual communication. In the context of writing classroom, showing sample texts may be one of the techniques to enable the presentation of a target task. Engaging receptively with these tasks enables learners to “begin to focus their attention on trying to understand what is said or written, thereby initiating their noticing of what forms are used in what ways” (Norris, 2009, pp. 583-585). During the pedagogic task phase, tasks are segmented and elaborated so that students can raise their awareness of new forms and their use of particular functions. The pedagogic task phase therefore emphasizes form-function relationships through learner analysis of discoursal, textual, rhetorical, and linguistic features of texts. Feedback (e.g., models and grammatical explanations) and teacher scaffolding also play a crucial role during this phase
in order to foster learner awareness of target language forms. *Target task* calls upon learners to demonstrate what they have learned through multiple iterations of pedagogic tasks in actually performing the target task. A *task follow-up* phase encourages learners to reflect on what they have learned previously, performance strengths and weaknesses, and perceived difficulty, all of which lead to “instructional decisions regarding what features are in need of subsequent repetition or expansion” (Norris, 2009, p. 585).

6.2 **Innovative instruction: Genre-task integration**

From the perspective of L2 literature, it can be argued that the genre- and task-based approaches to teaching L2 writing is innovative for the following two reasons. First, translating the ideas of task into practice has been attempted and researched mainly in the context of developing oral communication competence of L2 learners, and applying task to L2 writing pedagogy has been scarcely implemented to date. Second, although genre-based approaches have been administered in many L2 writing courses since the early 1990s, integrating task into genre has not been fully attempted in their syllabus design and materials development, except for Georgetown University’s German Program (e.g., Byrnes, 2009; Byrnes et., 2006, 2011). Thus, the genre-task integration in the context of EFL writing that was designed and carried out in the present study is a new attempt in the existing literature.

The innovation of genre- and task-based approach to EFL writing can also be argued from the perspective of the institution in which the present study was conducted. The genre- and task-based approaches were administered in the 2009 academic year in an attempt to reform the existing syllabi for ENG 201 (Writing for Communication) and ENG
202 (Reading for Academic Purposes). Table 6.1 summarizes some notable features of the revised courses that started in 2009 in comparison with those of the same courses that had been administered previously.

Table 6.1  Features of the innovations in the instructional design of this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>The revised syllabus (starting in 2009)</th>
<th>The previous syllabus (prior to 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 201: Writing for Communication</td>
<td>- <em>Genre</em>-based (needs analysis) - <em>Task</em>-based - Focus on meaning-conveyance (field, tenor, mode) - Emails in various authentic rhetorical contexts - Use of multiple models - Use of authentic genres - A wider range of task types and sequences (task-input, pedagogic task, target task, and task follow-up)</td>
<td>- <em>Mode</em>-based - <em>Exercise</em>-based - Focus on textual awareness (mode) - Five paragraph essays by means of various modes - Use of a single model - Use of a textbook - A limited range of task types and sequences (task input and pedagogic task)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 202: Reading for Academic Purposes</td>
<td>- <em>Genre</em>-based (needs analysis) - <em>Task</em>-based - Focus on the text’s generic structure and its purpose (field, tenor, mode) - Use of authentic genres - Integrating summary writing and reading - A wider range of task types and sequences (task-input, pedagogic task, target task, and task follow-up).</td>
<td>- <em>Content</em>-based - <em>Exercise</em>-based - Focus on comprehension of the subject matter (field) - Use of a textbook - Practicing new vocabulary and grammar used in the text - A limited range of task types and sequences (task input and pedagogic task)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the most significant features that made both courses innovative was that targeted genres and lexicogrammatical resources to be taught were selected based on task-based linguistic needs analysis (see Appendix E). As discussed in Chapter 5, the needs analysis revealed that “writing emails for various rhetorical purposes” and “summarizing a source text” were recognized by both students and faculty as the most important genres that were closely related to their situated, real-life needs. Accordingly, email writing was incorporated into ENG 201 and summary writing into ENG 202 as a core genre in the 2009 revised syllabus. It should be noted here that regarding the label of email as a genre, as discussed in Chapter 2 (see 2.5), this study uses the term email as an overall umbrella concept to indicate a variety of email genres that are realized through the interpersonal communication medium (e.g., thank-you email, request email, and inquiry email). Emails are used to achieve multiple rhetorical functions or purposes, such as making requests, transmitting information, responding to information, maintaining contact, chatting, and so on (Al-Ali & Sahawneh, 2008; Gains, 1999; Martin, Myers, & Mottet, 1999; Shaw & Weir, 2007). Within SFL theory, these different rhetorical functions or purposes play a role in defining genres. Thus, this study uses email as a comprehensive term that indicates the range of genres that are realized through the medium of email.

The results of the needs analysis led to a significant shift in how writing and reading are taught to the students in ENG 201 and ENG 202 respectively. Due to their adoption of genre-based approaches, their pedagogical focus shifted to facilitating students’ rhetorical awareness by highlighting the configuration of the three register variables that have a primary effect on the type of language that is chosen to realize a genre: field (ideational meaning), tenor (interpersonal meaning), and mode (textual meaning). Focusing on the
“registerial bundling” (Byrnes et al., 2010, p. 126) and its effect on language choices was innovative, given that the previous ENG 201 and ENG 202’s syllabi had focused on a single rhetorical variable: mode (ENG 201) and field (ENG 202) respectively. That is, the previous ENG 201 course employed mode-based approaches, aiming to teach students specific textual formats for paragraph writing, or what are often called “rhetorical modes,” e.g., “illustration, exemplification, comparison, contrast, partition, classification, and so on” (Silva, 1990, pp. 14-15). From these rhetorical modes, teachers developed a series of paragraph or essay templates in order to help students to learn the textual formats of academic writing in English or “essayist literacy” (Johns, 2011, p. 58). In a similar vein, the previous ENG 202, whose primary goal was to help students understand discipline-specific knowledge in English, was underpinned by content-based approaches, resulting in its focus on a single register variable: field. In the content-based course, students were asked to comprehend every word of the text and to respond to a list of comprehension questions about the text. To understand what the text is about should be an important goal of EFL reading courses; however, the new ENG 202 syllabus aimed to help students pay attention not only to what the text is about but also to how and why it is produced and how it can be reused for different purposes for different audiences. How this was achieved is summarized in Table 6.2, which describes guiding questions for enhancing students’ awareness of the registerial bundling of field, tenor, and mode.
The guiding questions for facilitating students’ genre analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field (Ideational meaning)</th>
<th>Example questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>What is the purpose of this genre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>What information is addressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>What outcome does the writer want to achieve?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor (Interpersonal meaning)</th>
<th>Example questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Who is the writer of the genre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Who is the intended reader of the genre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>How does the reader’s background affect the writer’s language choices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>How might the writer’s choices be interpreted by the reader?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode (Textual meaning)</th>
<th>Example questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>What kinds of lexicogrammatical resources does the writer select to achieve the purpose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>How does the writer begin and end the text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>What transitional signals are chosen by the writer to manage the flow of information?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of task types and sequences employed was another notable feature of the innovations. Since the previous syllabi focused on a single rhetorical variable (i.e., mode for ENG 201; field for ENG 202), the range of task types and sequences was limited to task-input and pedagogic task. Accordingly, language was used to learn a set of rules (rhetorical modes) in ENG 201 and to learn contents (discipline-specific content knowledge) in ENG 202. In-text exercises were used at the end of each unit so as to assess students’ mastering of the target forms or their comprehension of the text. However, the new syllabi employed not only task input and pedagogic task but also target task and task follow-up so that students can learn new lexicogrammatical resources in a step-by-step manner toward the accomplishment of a target task and use language as a set of resources to convey meaning to the intended audience. Particularly important was that the target task
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was designed in a way that was as authentic as possible. It was assumed that due to the authenticity, learners who could see the connection between the target task and the real world would be much more motivated to engage in a range of tasks, solve the problem at hand, and learn language to achieve an outcome. The next sections provide more details into the innovative features of ENG 201 and ENG 202.

6.3 English 201: Email writing

6.3.1 A pedagogical shift from mode-based to genre-based approaches

As described above, the new syllabus for the ENG 201 course (Writing for Communication) was characterized by the shift from mode-based to genre-based approaches. This pedagogical shift, however, did not indicate that rhetorical modes and forms were ignored in the new syllabus; instead, the revised ENG 201 assumed that writers would be able to learn rhetorical modes through reading and writing authentic genres that are related to their target task, not merely through being exposed to conventional five-paragraph essays. The authentic genres included blogs and advertisement, which were collected from online resources. These resources were then interspersed into e-mail writing tasks so that students were able to interact with various genres and understand how they are related to or different from one another. Table 6.3 offers the course schedule for ENG 201 and the interspersed authentic genres.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Interspersed genres</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>April 5</td>
<td>Writing email to introduce yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2    | April 12 | *Pre-instructional writing task*:
Writing email to make a request |                          | Assignment 1                |
| 3    | April 19 | Writing email to express gratitude & apology    | Letter to the editor      |                                 |
| 4    | May 26   | Writing email to express congratulations        | Magazine article          | Assignment 2                    |
| 5    | May 10   | Writing email to make an appointment            |                          |                                 |
| 6    | May 17   | Writing email to make an announcement           | Blog                      |                                 |
| 7    | May 24   | Writing email to arrange to meet and change arrangements |                          | Assignment 3                    |
| 8    | May 31   | Writing email to make a request                 |                          |                                 |
| 9    | June 7   | Writing email to make an inquiry                | Tourist information       |                                 |
| 10   | June 14  | Writing email to make a reservation             | Hotel brochure            | Assignment 4                    |
| 11   | June 21  | Writing email to deal with problems             | New ads                   |                                 |
| 12   | June 28  | Writing email to ask for advice                 |                          |                                 |
| 13   | July 5   | Writing email to apply for a job                | Classified ads, resume,   | Assignment 5                    |
|      |          |                                                | cover letter               |                                 |
| 14   | July 12  | Writing email to give an opinion and recommend  |                          |                                 |
| 15   | July 26  | Wrap up                                        |                          |                                 |
| 16   | August 2 | Final exam
*Post-instructional writing task*:
Writing an email to make a request |                          |                                 |

*The pre-instructional task on Week 2 and the post-instructional task on Week 16 served as the data sources for this study.*
For example, when the students learned how to write emails to make an announcement in Week 6, they were asked to write, as a target task, about their university’s school festival and invite international students who wanted to know what Japanese school festivals look like there. Toward the completion of this target task, the students were exposed to an authentic blog entry posted by an English native speaker who had experienced the university’s school festival in the previous year (see Appendix H). The students were then asked to analyze the blog entry at the three register levels: (1) field (What is the name of the genre? What is the purpose of the genre?); (2) tenor (Who is the writer of the text? Who is the intended reader of the text?); and (3) mode (What lexicogrammatical resources are used to express the interesting features of the school festival? How is the text structured? Which sentence is a thesis statement? Which is a topic sentence?). Analyzing the authentic genre in this way served as a pedagogic task to help the students to become familiar with lexicogrammatical resources to express the school festival (i.e., ideational resources) and to identify rhetorical features that shaped a “descriptive” mode, along with a thesis statement and topic sentences (i.e., textual resources). Then, the students engaged in “genre conversion” (Ifantidou, 2011) activities, where they were asked to think about and discuss how and to what degree rhetorical features of the blog entry could be applied or would need to be modified to produce a different genre for a different audience—the invitation email (i.e., their target task: inviting international students to the school festival). Through such rhetorical analysis of authentic genres, it was expected that the students would be able to learn various rhetorical modes or discourse structures, which seemed to be much more rewarding than using a five-paragraph essay model employed in the previous ENG 201 course (see the essay example in Appendix I) in that the purpose and
the writer of the authentic genre can be more explicitly sensed by students than in the five-paragraph essay appearing in a writing textbook. More importantly, the authentic text served as a springboard for the students to accomplish their target task at a later phase and therefore motivated their “writerly engagement with texts” (Cheng, 2008a, p. 66, emphasis in the original) in ways that fulfilled their situated needs.

6.3.2 The pedagogical values of email writing

Due to its interactive nature, according to Baron (1998), email reflects the linguistic profile of four dimensions: social dynamics (the relationship between participants), format (the physical parameters resulting from the technology), grammar (the lexical and syntactic aspects of the message) and style (the choices made to convey semantic intent expressed through selection of lexical, grammatical, and discourse options). To realize a specific genre, email writers need to pay attention to these multiple dimensions before and while writing the message and to make a decision to choose a maximally appropriate form from various options available.

Genre realization processes undertaken by email writers have become more complex as email displays hybrid characteristics of both spoken and written language and can be considered a type of mixed contact system (Al-Ali & Sahawneh, 2008). On one hand, email writers may feel liberated from the restriction of traditional letter writing rules. On the other, they may find it difficult to choose an appropriate lexicogrammatical resource to meet the recipient’s standards, as Chen (2006) addressed. The hybrid nature of email writing could pose an even greater challenge to FL writers who tend to be limited in language awareness of how genre shapes and is shaped by the relationship between the writer and the reader.
Thus, to be a successful email writer requires not merely fluency and accuracy, but also “the ability both to express oneself using a variety of language forms and rhetorical strategies as well as to know when it is appropriate to use these different forms” (Bloch, 2002, p. 132). In this study, the syllabus was designed so that students can develop this pragmatic ability through various interactive contexts relevant to their real-life needs.

6.3.3 Genre-based and task-based approaches to email writing

For the materials development, I collected various prototypical genre models in an attempt to include samples whose style, tone, and formality varied according to purpose and audience so that students were able to gain an explicit understanding of how language changes as it encounters changes in social relationship. Appendix J provides an example of the prototypical genre models, which were used in Week 7 (writing email to arrange to meet and change arrangements). The two emails described in Appendix J were written by the same person for the same functional goal, but each is addressed to different recipients.

In the task input phase, the two emails were analyzed by the students in terms of the SFL notion of three register variables: (1) field (the propositional content of text and the relationship between ideas), (2) tenor (interpersonal relationship between the writer and the reader), and (3) mode (discourse to organize a text, strings of words, or isolated sentences and clauses). The students received a worksheet that asked them to analyze specific properties of the text based on the guiding questions. The example worksheet used for Week 7 is provided in Table 6.4.
Table 6.4  Student worksheet for analysis of the genre models

The two emails are written by the same person (Jon), but each is addressed to different recipient. Read and analyze the two emails and answer the following questions.

1. Content
   - Why does Jon write this email?
   - What outcome does the writer want to achieve?

2. The relationship between Jon and the two recipients
   - What is the relationship between Jon and Mr. Yamato?
   - What is the relationship between Jon and Mari?
   - How does the recipient’s status affect the way Jon chose language and style?
   - How might Jon’s language choices be interpreted by the recipient?

3. Language
   - What kinds of lexicogrammatical resources does Jon use to achieve the purpose?
   - What information is addressed in each paragraph?
   - How is the overall message organized?
   - How does Jon begin and end the message?

The students carried out discussions in pairs first and then as a whole class. After the in-class discussion on rhetorical features of the email samples, the formulaic, genre-specific expressions were taught explicitly. The explicit instruction of genre-specific resources was intended to encourage students to consciously focus on the relationship between functional goals and lexicogrammatical resources and to develop their language knowledge alongside genre knowledge. Table 6.5 provides a list of sentence stems and genre-specific expressions
Table 6.5 Examples of genre-specific expressions taught explicitly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Writing email to introduce yourself</td>
<td>- Salutation and closing (e.g., Dear, Sincerely, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing email to express gratitude/apology</td>
<td>- I appreciate…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I am grateful for…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Thank you very much for…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Many thanks for…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Please accept my apologies for…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I apologize for…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I am sorry for…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- My apologies for…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Writing email to express congratulations</td>
<td>- Congratulations on…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I am pleased to hear…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- You deserve…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I am proud of…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Writing email to make an appointment</td>
<td>- Do you think that it would be possible for you to…?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I would appreciate it if you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I was wondering if you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Writing email to make an announcement</td>
<td>- I am pleased to announce…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I am writing to inform…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Just wanted to let you know…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Writing email to arrange to meet and change arrangements</td>
<td>- We’ll have to reschedule/rearrange…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- We are sorry for any inconvenience this might cause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sorry for the last minute change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Writing email to make a request</td>
<td>- Could you …? / Would you …?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I would appreciate it if you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I was wondering if you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I would be pleased if you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Writing email to make an inquiry</td>
<td>- I am writing this to inquire about…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Thank you for help in advance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | Writing email to make a reservation | - I would like to reserve/book…
|    |                                 | - I wonder if _____ is still available.
|    |                                 | - Can I have _____? |
| 11 | Writing email to deal with problems | - I am writing regarding …
|    |                                 | - I am writing to complain about…
|    |                                 | - I would be grateful if you could give me a full refund. |
| 12 | Writing email to apply for a job | - I am writing in response to…
|    |                                 | - I would like to apply for…
|    |                                 | - I have a bachelor’s degree in…
|    |                                 | - I am eager to… |
| 13 | Writing email to give directions | - Go straight along / until…
|    |                                 | - Turn right / left at …
|    |                                 | - _____ is on the right / left.
|    |                                 | - _____ is next to / across from … |
| 14 | Writing email to give an opinion and recommend | - I highly recommend…
|    |                                 | - It’s worth…
|    |                                 | - OK, but nothing special. |

During the *pedagogic task phase*, the instructional focus shifted to language awareness activities that involved exploring rhetorical choices via writing exercises in pairs or small groups. The students were given an authentic sociorhetorical context and were asked to write two short emails addressed to different recipients to achieve the same functional purpose. Table 6.6 provides an example pedagogic task used in Week 7.
Table 6.6  Student worksheet for language awareness activities in the first semester

Suppose you were an international student at a U.S. university and were in the following situation:

Your biology professor, Dr. Andres, says that your paper sounds like random thoughts and you will fail the class if you cannot learn to organize. You need to pass the class, so you need to get a clearer understanding of his expectations.

A. Write an email to arrange to meet with Professor Andres to get some advice from him.

B. Write an email to arrange to meet with your friend, Tom, to get some advice from him. Tom is good at writing and always get better grades than you.

NOTE. There are several things you should consider before writing:

(1) What is the purpose of this email?
(2) Who is the recipient of this email?
(3) What information will be necessary and how will it be structured?
(4) What language will be maximally appropriate to achieve the purpose?

In order to complete the pedagogic task, the students were encouraged to assess the degree
of formality based on their analysis of who the reader was and for what purpose each email needed to be written. They were then asked to carefully consider what lexicogrammatical resources would be maximally appropriate to achieve the outcome and how the overall message would need to be structured. The students were given 5 minutes for each email, and some students were asked to write their email message on the blackboard. The emails they wrote were then shared with classmates and analyzed in class focusing on their language choices, how their choices were the same or different, and why. These pedagogic tasks aimed to solidify students’ understanding of which linguistic choices were maximally appropriate in a given sociorhetorical context.

The pedagogic task phase was followed by a target task phase, where the students were asked to write an email of substantial length in response to the rhetorical demands of a given context, purpose, and reader. Each target task was given as an outside-class assignment every three weeks, namely, Week 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13. Thus, the students completed five target tasks in total over the 15-week course. Appendix K provides a set of the target task prompts. For the audience of each task, I created an imagined audience that went beyond a teacher so that students are able to experience a variety of interactive contexts. The imagined audiences included a student’s friend who wants to make meeting arrangements, an international student who wants to know about the university, and a travel agency staff who deals with a student’s ticket reservation. By doing so, attempts were made to include more formal and less formal email writing tasks.

Finally, the task follow-up phase for each assignment took place when the assignment was returned to each student. At this phase, the students reflected on their performance strengths and weaknesses by referencing their instructor’s comments and
feedback. The comments included both responses to the content from a receiver of their message and feedback on language form from a teacher. Free writing activities were given to students from time to time in order for me to see if there were some changes in their perceptions of or beliefs about what constitutes a good email writing.

6.4  English 202: Summarization

6.4.1  A pedagogical shift from content-based to genre-based approaches

As a result of the adoption of genre- and task-based syllabus, the ENG 202 course also demonstrated a significant shift in its approach to teaching reading. Prior to 2009, ENG 202 focused on scientific reading so as to help the students to understand the contents of research reports contained in a textbook and become familiar with biological concepts in English (e.g., molecular biology, endangered species, and photosynthesis, etc.). Since the primary focus of the course was to understand the subject matter (i.e., what the text is about), the students were expected to comprehend every word of the text and to even translate every single sentence in Japanese and respond to a list of comprehension exercises about the text.

The revised ENG 202 course, on the other hand, focused not only on understanding what the text is about but also on explaining how it is written (the text’s generic structure) and used (the purpose of the text) for whom (the audience of the text) and expressing the gist of the text in their own words for different audiences (summarization). Thus, summary writing activities, along with analysis of rhetorical features of the source text, were integrated in scientific reading in the new ENG 202 course. Table 6.7 describes the course schedule for ENG 202. Importantly, the revised ENG 202 course did not use one particular
textbook, but instead used authentic academic genres, such as brief research reports, magazine columns, and newspaper articles. These genres were interspersed into the course so that the students were able to experience various academic genres and gain a keener awareness of the relationship among genre, register, and language. The reading topics were selected by the instructor, following advice from biology professors at the institution.

Table 6.7 The course schedule for ENG 202

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reading topic</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Summary writing Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>September 20</td>
<td>Disappearance of Wildlife</td>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>Assignment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>September 27</td>
<td>The Uses of Genetics <em>(Pre-instructional writing task</em>)</td>
<td>Research report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>October 4</td>
<td>Animal Behavior: Associative Learning</td>
<td>Research report</td>
<td>Assignment 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>Animal Behavior: Communication</td>
<td>Research report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>Evolving Animals</td>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>Assignment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>November 8</td>
<td>Personality of Dogs</td>
<td>Research report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Animal Species</td>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>Assignment 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>November 22</td>
<td>Species Diversity of Mammals</td>
<td>Newspaper article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>November 29</td>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>December 6</td>
<td>What is TPP?</td>
<td>Newspaper article</td>
<td>Assignment 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>December 13</td>
<td>TPP &amp; Domestic Agriculture</td>
<td>Newspaper article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>December 20</td>
<td>Hirofumi Yamashita’s Three Star Vegetables</td>
<td>Magazine column</td>
<td>Assignment 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, summaries are defined as a method of conveying a condensed version of information to people (Goldstein, 2008) based on the writer’s comprehension, evaluation, condensation, and transformation of ideas that have been presented in the source text (Hidi & Anderson, 1986). Unlike this general definition of summary writing, summarization in this study was defined as the writer’s evaluation, condensation, and transformation of the source information, with less attention being paid to their comprehension itself. This was due to the research setting where the students attempted their summaries after the content to be comprehended was given in class.

6.4.2 The pedagogical values of summary writing

It was expected that integrating reading and writing in this way could be pedagogically much more valuable than focusing solely on reading comprehension for two reasons. First, summarizing inherently asks students to transform the original information
to meet the reader’s needs. Summarization is thus equivalent to a “genre conversion” (Ifantidou, 2011), thereby enabling students to experience various rhetorical contexts and raise their genre awareness. Unlike general academic writing, which maintains a two-way interpersonal relationship between the reader and the writer, summary writing is based on a three-way relationship: “Not only do student writers have a relationship with their reader but they must also take into account their relationship with the writer of the source” (Drury, 1991, p. 436). Thus, student writers have to play a role as a reader and a writer at the same time and attempt to transform the original author’s ideas and establish new meanings in order to make them work for new audiences in different contexts (Delaney, 2008; Spivey, 2007). Summarizing can therefore be seen as a “dialogic” process of making meaning in specific communicative text in consideration of the reader’s needs and the purpose of the genre (Martin & White, 2005). Secondly, the transformation of the original author’s ideas requires much more systematic and complete understanding of the source information; therefore, summary writing could facilitate students’ engagement in reading. This is important not only to help students to gain discipline-specific content knowledge and terminology but also to help them to evaluate the content for the selection of the important information, identify the discourse structure of the text, and raise awareness of how to reformulate a concise and coherent representation of the original meaning.

The pedagogical value of summary writing can also be addressed in terms of its cognitively demanding operations. Evaluation, condensation, and transformation of ideas presented in L2 texts require not merely L2 proficiency but also rhetorical awareness, involving formal schemata (all formal expectations of summarization, such as format, rhetorical patterns, conventions of paraphrasing, quotation, and documentation) and
metacognitive skills (goal setting, applying the comprehended material to the task at hand, evaluating the summary in terms of its relationship to the specific purpose, etc) (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991). According to Kirkland and Sanders (1991), experienced writers can perform these formal and metacognitive functions automatically as part of their normal reading-to-writing strategy, whereas inexperienced writers may lack these skills and schemata and can be empowered by explicit instruction and training. In fact, researchers especially in the field of cognitive psychology have demonstrated that younger, novice L1 student writers benefit from explicit training (Casazza, 1993; Hill, 1991; Honnert & Bozan, 2005; Kim, 2001; Radmacher & Latosi-Sawin, 1995; Sjostrom & Hare, 1984). It is therefore expected that L2 writers, who are simultaneously challenged by both their limited linguistic resources and their lack of familiarity with written registers, can also benefit from the same instruction and training. Thus, the genre- and task-based summary instruction in this study focused on developing formal schemata and metacognitive skills and then examined how students’ summary writing changed as they experienced such instruction.

6.4.3 Genre- and task-based approaches to summary writing

To develop students’ formal schemata of summarization, the instruction and materials for this study dealt with the following three constructs necessary for successful summarization: (1) evidentials as metadiscourse markers (Hyland, 2000) or metastatement (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978), (2) moves or organizational patterns that consist of thesis statement and supporting ideas (Friend, 2001; Rivard, 2001; Yu, 2007); (3) grammatical metaphors by means of nominalization (Drury, 1991; Hood, 2003). Examples of the three formal schemata are summarized in Table 6.8.


Table 6. 8  Examples of instructed formal schemata of summarization taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidentials / Metastatement</th>
<th>According to X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X points out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X indicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X argues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X believes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X suggests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X proves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X demonstrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Studies / research / literature / findings / results |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves (Organizational patterns)</th>
<th>A good summary has the following moves:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Thesis statement: The thesis statement is the “main idea” of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supporting statement: The author supports his/her thesis with supporting ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation patterns</th>
<th>- Grammatical metaphors my means of nominalizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i.e., ideational grammatical metaphors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rationales for the selection of these three items are as follows. First, the metadiscourse category of evidentials are central to the social context of summarization as they highlight objectivity and demonstrate the distance between the writer and the author of the original text—showing the audience that what is written is the summarization of someone else’s ideas, not the writer’s (e.g., According to X, X points out, X indicates, etc.). Second, summarization requires abilities to delete unimportant information, generalize ideas, and invent topic sentences expressing the essential gist of the source text (Van Dijk...
& Kintsh, 1983). These abilities manifest themselves in the quality of the two kinds of rhetorical moves, involving thesis statement and supporting ideas (Friend, 2001; Rivard, 2001; Yu, 2007). Finally, transformations of original sentences are essential for summarization since inadequate transformations could result in plagiarism. Winograd (1984) identified three broad categories of transformation: reproductions, combinations, and inventions. Reproductions are instances where writers reproduced original sentences, usually through direct copying. Combinations are transformations where writers combined two or more sentences in the original passage into one sentence. Inventions refer to instances where writers integrated main ideas of several paragraphs or the whole passage. Studies have shown that inexperienced summarizers are more likely to resort to reproduction and less likely to depend on combinations and inventions (Friend, 2001; Winograd, 1984; Yu, 2007). Importantly, the strategies like combinations and inventions are often realized by means of nominalizations in writers’ attempts to condense information in a generalized manner, which are described within the SFL framework as grammatical metaphors. For example, Keck’s (2006) study on students’ paraphrasing strategies revealed that L1 students’ summaries contained more nominalizations by packing longer information expressed with clauses into a shorter phrase than L2 students’ summaries, which were characterized by the use of synonyms (e.g., “idea” for “notion” and “salary” for “wage”) or simple syntactic changes (see also Drury, 1991, for the frequent use of nominalization by L1 writers). Likewise, Baba’s (2009) study on L2 writers’ summarization showed that their knowledge of the well-structured semantic network of words (e.g., superordinate words, hyponyms and co-hyponyms) and the ability to metalinguistically manipulate these words (e.g., syntactic operation by changing grammatical structures of the source sentences)
significantly constituted the construct of successful summary writing. Interestingly, similarly to those of Keck’s (2006) study, the student’s sample summaries presented in Baba’s study indicated that the use of grammatical metaphor by means of nominalization, which contributed to creating generalized statements, might be the most important aspect of lexical proficiency in summary writing. The following selected sample provided by Baba (2009) shows the role that grammatical metaphor plays in generalizing the source information in a summarized text.

The source sentence:
Whigs and Democrats differed not only in their attitudes toward the market but also about how active the central government should be in people’s lives.

The summarized sentence:
Democrats and Whigs also differed in their perspectives on the role of government.

These empirical reports indicate that good summary writers are able to perform generative operations that compress the text, and that these generative operations can be expressed by the use of nominalization or grammatical metaphor, which appears to be the key linguistic operation required for effective summarization.

In addition to these formal schemata, a good summary requires another important function—metacognitive skills, which enable writers to evaluate the summary in terms of its relationship to a specific purpose and audience. Just like other written genres for interactive communication, summaries are written in a way suitable for the intended
audiences’ use and to suit their information seeking needs. Summary writers should pay conscious attention to the needs of the audience and try to contain the information that the audience would like to know rather than merely shorten the information content of the original document (Goldstein, 2008; Hidi & Anderson, 1986; Hill 1991). For instance, an expert in a specific academic field might not want summaries that include detailed background information that she or he already knows. In this case, the expert may be satisfied with overview summaries. Another type of summary might contain the content for which the intended audience is needing or searching for—goal-specific summary—the one which addresses a specific reader’s information seeking goal. According to Goldstein (2008), summarization systems can be explained in terms of these two types of summaries: (1) the generic summary, which gives the reader an overall sense of the document's content, and (2) a goal-focused or topic-based summary, which presents the content that is most closely related to the reader’s information seeking needs or a particular topic. Common ground to effective summary writing, irrespective of whether it is a generic summary or a goal-focused, topic-based summary, is that summaries need to be tailored in a manner suitable for a certain rhetorical context, including the intended audience’s needs, the purpose of the summary, and the situation in which the writer is summarizing a source text. In other words, summary writing represents a rhetorical process of making new meaning—selecting the most appropriate information and transforming the original meaning to make it accessible to the new audience. This can be done by shifting focus from specific to general or from concrete to abstract in response to the new contextual demands. This perspective on summary writing—summarization as a rhetorical process of making meaning—was integral to the genre-based materials and in-class activities employed for
In order to help students understand that summaries are not monolithic but should be tailored for different purposes and for different audiences, I created different types of model summaries, such as an overview summary and a goal-focused summary. The different types of summary samples, along with the original text, are shown in Appendix L. I also used the summary models whose quality varied in terms of paraphrasing. Some model summaries contained well-invented paraphrasing with the appropriate use of evidentials, whereas others consisted of reproduced or directly-copied sentences with few expressions of evidentials. The different quality summaries were collected from a corpus of summaries written by previous students who had enrolled in the same course in the previous year. By exposing students to different types of models in this way, attempts were made to raise students’ awareness of how the same genre might differ depending on the reader’s needs and what constitutes a good summary depending on sociorhetorical situations.

As have been designed for email writing activities in the first semester, the task input phase for the second-semester course assignment had students analyze multiple summary samples in terms of the three register variables (field, tenor, and mode). Table 6.9 shows a worksheet used for the analysis of summary samples presented in Appendix L.
Table 6.9  Student worksheet for analysis of the genre models

The three passages (those presented in Appendix L) are summaries of the article titled “The Disappearance of Wildlife.” Read and analyze the three summaries and answer the following questions.

1. Content
   - What is a main topic of the original article?
   - How each of the three summaries addresses the main topic?
   - Which sentence plays a role as a thesis statement?
   - How is the thesis statement in each summary supported by further details?
   - Which summary sample do you think is better than the others? Why?

2. The relationship between the summarizer, the original author, and the audience
   - Suppose the intended audience of your summary were a secondary school student, which summary sample do you think s/he would prefer? Why?
   - If the intended audience of your summary were a professor, which summary sample do you think s/he would prefer? Why?
   - How does the summarizer acknowledge the original author?

3. Language
   - How does the summarizer reword the source information in a way that avoids copying the original author’s words verbatim?
   - What kinds of lexicogrammatical resources does the writer use to generalize the gist?
   - What kinds of lexicogrammatical resources does the writer use to condense the information?
   - How is the summary organized?

For the pedagogic task phase, students were provided with paraphrasing exercises, which asked them to read a short passage, paraphrase it, and report the gist of the source information objectively by using various expressions for evidentials (see Table 6.8). These
exercises aimed to build a foundation for completing a target task that follows. The students engaged in the exercises individually first, and then shared their paraphrases in pairs. The students were also asked to self-evaluate their own paraphrases on the basis of the prompts, such as *What do you think makes your summary good? Where do you think you need to improve? What do you think is the most difficult part of paraphrasing?* Table 6.10 provides a worksheet for the pedagogic task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.10</th>
<th>Student worksheet for paraphrasing strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owing passage and paraphrase it by putting it into your own words for the audience who might be unfamiliar with the source content.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Galilei published a small book describing astronomical observations that he had made of the skies above Padua. His homemade telescopes had less magnifying and resolving power than most beginners’ telescopes sold today, yet with them he made astonishing discoveries: that the moon has mountains and other topographical features; that Jupiter is orbited by satellites, which he called planets; and that the Milky Way is made up of individual stars. From David Owen, “The Dark Side: Making War on Light Pollution,” The New Yorker (20 August 2007): 28.

**Possible paraphrase:**

1. Evaluate your paraphrase and think about:
   - What do you think makes your summary good?
   - Where do you think you need to improve?
(3) What do you think is the most difficult part of paraphrasing?

After the pair discussion, the students received an example of possible paraphrase written by the instructor, which is described in Table 6.11. The sample paraphrase was then analyzed by the students in pairs again, with a focus on what makes this summary good, how and in what ways the sample paraphrase is different from their paraphrases, and what lexicogrammatical resources they might want to use for their future summary tasks, and why.

Table 6.11 Student worksheet for analysis of an example of paraphrasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Read the following paraphrase and compare it with your own paraphrase.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible paraphrase:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen (2007) addresses that Galileo was able to make some amazing discoveries with his telescope. According to Owen, Galileo made discoveries about the moon, about Jupiter, and about the Milky Way. He was able to do this with a telescope that was less powerful than even today's most basic telescopes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluate the paraphrase and think about:

(1) What makes this summary good?

(2) How and in what ways is the sample paraphrase different from your paraphrase?

(3) What lexicogrammatical resources would you like to use for their future summary tasks, why?

For the target task phase, an imagined audience was created that went beyond a
teacher, such as a high school student who might be unfamiliar with the topic discussed in the article and an expert in the field who might prefer a brief overview of the article. In this way, different sociorhetorical contexts were created so that the students were able to carefully examine the rhetorical situation in which they were summarizing, identify the appropriate depth of information, use language and transform sentences appropriately to suit different purposes. The target task was undertaken in the form of outside-class assignment. As shown in Table 6.7, the students engaged in summary writing of the article every two or three weeks, namely, Week 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, and 14, and thus they completed seven summaries in total over the 15-week course.

The task follow-up phase, which usually took place after students’ summaries were returned, was the place for students to reflect on what they had learned with regard to what summarization is about and what constitutes a good summary. For class discussion, I used some selected good summary samples, asking students to discuss why they think the summary was selected as a good example, how the selected summary is different from the one that they wrote, and what aspects of selected summaries they want to use for their future summaries.

As described above, the genre-task synergies were controlled in ways that had nothing directly to do with the one-way prescriptive approach to teaching summarization. It was assumed that by means of genre- and task-based approaches, the students were able to experience varying ways of summarizing the text depending on the rhetorical contexts, gain a keener awareness of the audience’s needs and the purpose, and importantly, use the same rhetorical analysis for their future summary writing.
6.5 Some other activities interspersed to raise rhetorical awareness

Besides learning the two specific genres, developing more sophisticated knowledge of genre in general was the other important goal of the genre-based writing course. To this end, the two-semester course sequence included many other writing pieces in different genres and text forms interspersed with email (first semester) or summary writing (second semester), as described in the course schedules for ENG 201 (see Table 6.3) and ENG for 202 (see Table 6.7). The list of genres included in these other writing activities is presented in Table 6.5.

Table 6.12 List of genres interspersed to each of the courses

| ENG 201 (Email writing) | - Letter to the editor  
|                        | - Hotel Brochure  
|                        | - Blog  
|                        | - Job advertisement  
|                        | - Resume  
|                        | - Cover letter  
| ENG 202 (summary writing) | - Textbook  
|                        | - Newspaper articles  
|                        | - Brief research reports  
|                        | - Magazine articles  

Each genre piece presented in Table 6.12 reflects a different facet of the purpose and intended audience. It was expected that those different types of genres enabled students to learn different rhetorical features of written texts and different language choices to suit different purposes. Furthermore, students were expected, as they explored these different genres, to understand in what ways each of the core genres they have learned are different from, similar to, and/or linked to other genres and become more aware of genre chains and
networks as well as specific language choices and textual features for realizing each of the two core genres. It was thus assumed that having students compare various genres might significantly increase not only the noticing of rhetorical features of the target genres (i.e., acquisition of the core genres) but also the acquisition of “genre chains, sets, constellations, and ladders” (Hyland, 2007, p. 156) that enables students to capture the interrelationship of genres and to meet the rhetorical demands of various written contexts (i.e., awareness of genre in general).
CHAPTER 7
LONGITUDINAL CHANGES IN THE FIRST SEMESTER: E-MAIL WRITING

The main goal of the present study is to document how an innovative genre-based and task-based instructional design might change rhetorical awareness, as reflected in genre-relevant knowledge of the context of the situation and register-specific metafunctions of language, and productive use in individual EFL writers at two different proficiency levels, as reflected in ontogenetic changes in the overall quality of the written texts they produced before and after genre instruction at two different periods of time, namely at the end of each semester in the two-course sequence, as well as in their lexicogrammatical choices to create meaning in a given rhetorical context attested in the same pre- and post-instructional writing. To this effect, individual writers were traced over a period of one academic year by collecting triangulated longitudinal data through questionnaires, interviews, reflection papers (free writing), and written texts produced at the beginning and end of each semester in a two-course sequence.

This chapter reports the findings gleaned from the first semester of instruction on email writing as the target genre. The question of how EFL writers’ rhetorical awareness of email writing changed over time is first addressed on the basis of their reflective comments in the questionnaires, interviews, and free writing. The findings pertain to the students’ prior experience of writing emails in English, how they conceptualized email writing at the beginning of the course, and how their conceptualization of email writing changed over the course of the semester.
Following the rhetorical awareness data, the question of how their overall writing performance and their lexicogrammatical choices changed over time is analyzed and presented on the basis of the students’ textual products written at two different periods of time. The second set of findings is used to complement the rhetorical awareness data and allows us to explore whether and how their inner conceptualization of the genre is reflected in students’ actual meaning-making choices and production of the genre. As each finding is presented throughout the chapter, individual writers’ longitudinal changes are compared between the two different proficiency levels in order to ascertain whether and how writers at two different proficiency levels within the same course population may have mediated any benefits accrued from the systematically-designed, genre-based tasks and materials.

7.1 Longitudinal changes in genre-specific rhetorical awareness

Table 7.1 summarizes for the two intact classes separately the students’ responses about their prior experience, which were elicited at the beginning of the semester (April, 2010). The question was: To what extent do/did you have opportunities to write emails in English? An overwhelming majority of the students answered that they had no previous experience writing emails in English: Only 1 out of 30 students had some experience with email writing in English. The follow-up interviews confirmed that, at the beginning of the semester, the students had never before seen emails in English and did not know how to write one. My personal communication with the one student with some prior experience of English email writing further revealed that her high school had included several exchange students from Germany, and that for this reason she had had several chances to write an email message to one of the German students in English.
The second question on the questionnaire was as follows: *Have you ever been taught how to write emails in English?* None of the students’ answers was affirmative. These results suggest that the students might have enrolled in ENG 201 with only a vague understanding of and an implicit conceptualization of the genre.

Table 7.1 The students’ prior email-writing experiences

1. *To what extent do/did you have the opportunities to write emails in English?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. *Have you even been taught how to write emails in English?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* High Group (N = 15), Low Group (N = 15); Likert scale 1 = never, 2 = not very often, 3 = somewhat often, 4 = very often

However, the students’ less-informed understanding of the genre in L2 might have been complemented by their prior experience writing a similar genre in their L1. This was observed in their comments provided in response to the open-ended question regarding their beliefs: *Please tell me what constitutes a good email in your opinion. For example, if you write a request email to someone, what kind of things do you think about when writing?*

Table 7.2 summarizes the responses. A total of 42 idea units were elicited from the students’
comments and then analyzed to identify certain key words, which were classified into three categories: (1) clarity and conciseness (24 cases); (2) politeness and humbleness (13 cases); and (3) organization and structure (5 cases).

Table 7.2 The students’ conceptualization of email writing at the beginning of the semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Writing clearly and concisely</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Making the message sound polite and humble</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Writing a well-organized message</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To describe their opinions about what constitutes a good email, the majority of the students emphasized clarity and conciseness. Other notable elements in their concern were associated with tone and style, more specifically, how to make their message sound polite and humble. Some other comments were related to overall organization and structure. These comments appear to indicate that the students relied on a limited range of general writing rules that could be applicable to any type of written genres. In addition, they also relied on their beliefs shaped through their previous letter-writing experiences in L1, given the findings that the students had received little explicit instruction on how to write emails.
in L2. The students’ reliance on their L1 writing experience can be seen in the following accounts given by several of them, which were provided in their free writing exercise conducted during Week 3 after they engaged in their first email writing assignment (the name was not specified because the free writing was conducted anonymously). The free-writing prompt was: *How did you start writing your first email writing assignment? Tell me what you were thinking about while you wrote.*

[7.1]
_Since I have never written emails in English before, it is not easy for me to think of appropriate expressions in English. So, I have to think of what I want to say in Japanese first, in the same way as I write letters in Japanese, and then I translate it into English._ (An anonymous student)

[7.2]
_It’s impossible for me to write in English without translating it from Japanese. Not only because I’ve not been taught how to write emails in English but also because my English proficiency is not sufficient enough to do so. Since I always think of what I want to say in Japanese first and then translate that idea into English, the way I write emails in English might be achieved the same way._ (An anonymous student)

In Extracts [7.1] and [7.2], the students reported being unsure about how to write emails in L2 and relied only on their L1 schemata to complete the genre in L2. The extracts also showed that translating from L1 to L2 played an important role in the process of
completing the given task. As discussed by Sasaki (2000, 2002, 2004), translation appears to be one of the most important writing strategies employed by novice L2 writers. This also sheds light on the complex relationship between genre knowledge, L1 writing experience, and L2 proficiency. In other words, since EFL college learners are generally already literate in their L1, they might already be equipped to some extent with the genre knowledge necessary to perform a certain social action via their L1 literacy schemata, irrespective of the amount of L2 instruction previously received.

The beliefs and conceptualizations uncovered at the beginning of the course and just described were challenged and transformed by the end of the course, at least in part with the aid of the genre-based instruction students experienced. Table 7.3 shows the results of the self-assessment questionnaire conducted at the end of the semester (August 2010, see Appendix M). The first question was: To what degree do you think that you have improved your ability to write emails in English? As demonstrated in Table 7.3., all the students self-assessed positively and perceived that their ability to write emails had improved, although the degree of self-perception in their own improvement was different for the high and low proficiency groups.

Table 7.3  The students’ perception of their development as L2 writers of emails
1. To what degree do you think that you have improved your ability to write emails in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. To what degree do you think that you have changed your way of thinking about writing emails in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High Group (N = 15), Low Group (N = 15); Likert scale 1 = never, 2 = not very often, 3 = somewhat often, 4 = very often

A close analysis of the data suggested that the students at a higher proficiency level might have perceived more improvement than those at a lower proficiency level. The follow-up interviews indicated that the difference in perception between the groups might have been associated with the degree of confidence gained by the students. The students at a higher proficiency level generally commented that they not only felt improvement but also gained confidence in writing emails in English. These observations can be seen in the following accounts by Keiko and Eri at the follow-up interview (the original responses were in L1 Japanese and I provide English translations for readers’ ease):

[7.3]

*Before taking this class, I didn’t have the opportunity to write emails in English. So I had no idea what they should look like, and I didn’t know what vocabulary choices were the most appropriate to express what I wanted to write. However, as I read and analyzed a variety of email samples in this class, I learned some guidelines to draw upon and was able to develop my vocabulary choices, many of which I had already known but had not known how to actually use. The increasing*
choices allowed me to see email writing as very enjoyable, which also made me more confident when writing in English. (Keiko)

[7.4]

Because I had no manuals to refer to for email writing, I was very much afraid of email writing activities when this course started. However, as I learned a variety of situations for using the words that I had already known, I realized that email writing was not as difficult as I had first thought. Above all, I found it very interesting to get a response from the reader of my email based on what I wrote. This inspired me to write and communicate more without being afraid of making mistakes.

Extracts [7.3] and [7.4] provide an interesting insight into the nature of confidence and its relationship to students’ expansion of lexicogrammatical resources to make meaning in a given rhetorical context. Both students mention that they gained valuable experience from analyzing multiple models in class and increased their lexicogrammatical repertoires. Interestingly, both students recognized that many of the lexicogrammatical resources used in the models were the ones they had already known. The findings indicate that L2 students are likely to gain confidence when they understand how the linguistic resources they imbibed receptively are actually used to achieve a certain goal in a real-life situation. Importantly, the students’ accounts indicate that this form-meaning-function relationship can be promoted by exposing students to a variety of genre models, as multiple genre exemplars present the intricate relationship between language, audience, and purpose to create meaning in real-life situations.
Another notable point that can be drawn from the students’ accounts is the possible relationship between confidence and audience awareness. Extract [7.4] shows that Eri changed her views on email writing because of the response she received from the reader. That is, Eri gained confidence in writing emails due to her improved sense of audience. The findings suggest that while tasks not specifically designed for interactive communication also have an important role in a writing classroom (e.g., argumentative essays), and reciprocal tasks which are specifically intended to engage students to focus on the conveyance of meaning in the act of communication might play a more meaningful role in developing students’ willingness to write or increase opportunities to produce L2 outputs.

The second question of the semester-end questionnaire was: To what degree do you think that you have changed your way of thinking about writing emails in English? Table 7.3 shows that none of the 30 students responded to this question negatively, and some changes were perceived by each of the students, regardless of their English proficiency levels. This finding offers an interesting insight into lower proficiency students’ self-assessment: Although the students generally underestimated their own skill levels, they also perceived that something changed in their views on the genre.

To explore how and why they think they have changed their way of thinking about writing emails in English, the following open-ended question was provided: For those students who chose either “a little,” “somewhat,” or “a lot” in the second question, how and why do you think you have changed in the way you did? Table 7.4 summarizes the students’ answers about how they had changed. A total of 36 idea units were identified in the students’ accounts and then analyzed to identify certain keywords, which were then
classified into four categories: The students began to pay more attention to (1) language choices that best suits the purpose of the genre (14 cases); (2) formality and politeness that best suits the reader’s status (8 cases); (3) the depth of the content that best meets the reader’s needs (8 cases); and (4) reader-friendly organization and structure (6 cases).

Table 7.4 The students’ comments about how they have changed

For those students who chose either “a little,” “somewhat,” or “a lot” in the second question, how and why do you think you have changed in the way you did?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Finding better expressions in order to meet the purpose of the email.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Considering the reader’s status and refining expressions so that they can sound more formal and polite.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Considering what the reader needs and enriching the content.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Considering how each sentence is sequenced and how the overall text is structured so that they are reader-friendly.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4 shows that two important concerns emerged from the students at the end of the semester. First, the students became more aware of the given rhetorical context in which they were writing, including the purpose, the reader, and what information the reader needs. Second, based on their analysis of the rhetorical context, the students began to focus more consciously on what language they used (8 cases), to what extent they wrote formally and politely (8 cases), and what content they included and how the text was organized (6 cases). In other words, the students perceived the importance of considering the rhetorical context
first, and then chose maximally appropriate forms, necessary information, and effective sentence sequences and structures. It was of particular interest that these changes in rhetorical awareness were explicitly reported and hence presumably consciously perceived by the students from both groups. The findings show that the opportunities to interact with various rhetorical contexts in the genre-based writing classroom might have facilitated the students, irrespective of their proficiency levels, to change the way they think about the genre of email writing and the social factors they pay attention to when they actually write the genre. The following accounts were obtained at the follow-up interview from the lower proficiency students, Sayuri and Mizuho.

[7.5]

*Before taking this class, I had difficulties in coming up with words and phrases appropriate to the situation. For example, when I was asked to write an email to express gratitude, the expression that came to my mind was only “thank you.” So, the classroom tasks that taught us about the relationship among situation, readers, and language were really useful for me. I think I have learned some other phrases to express my gratitude, such as “I appreciate,” “I am grateful for,” and “thanks in advance,” depending on what situations I am writing.* (Sayuri)

[7.6]

*At the beginning of the semester, my concerns about writing were related to the correct use of grammar and the teacher’s evaluation. However, classroom activities, such as writing an email to an imaginary recipient for a particular purpose and*
receiving a response from the reader, made me realize that I am using a language to address a real person who wants me to write something. So, these days, my primary concern about writing is who a recipient is and what the recipient is and what he or she wants to know from my email. Although my grammar and word choices are still clumsy, I really enjoy writing emails simply as a means of communication. (Mizuho)

Upon closer examination, the two students’ accounts in Extracts [7.5] and [7.6] suggest that they might perceive a change in their genre awareness in different ways. That is, in Extract [7.5], Sayuri owes her change to her increased knowledge of lexicogrammatical choices appropriate to the context, while Mizuho in Extract [7.6] attributes her change to her improved awareness of the audience. Interestingly, these factors were similar to the ones observed in the accounts by Keiko and Eri (see Extracts [7.3] and [7.4]). Overall, it can be argued that the two important factors—writers’ refined awareness of language choices and their heightened awareness of audience—might play a key role in the students’ perception of their own changes in genre and rhetorical awareness.

The students’ comments in their free writing also provided other important insight into their refined genre awareness and its impact on their writing process. In the following accounts, the two students reported that they learned to spend more time for planning as a part of the writing process. The free-writing exercise was conducted in Week 14, after the students engaged in their fifth email-writing assignment. The prompt was: How did you start writing your fifth e-mail writing assignment? Tell me about any changes that you observed, compared with the beginning of the semester.
When writing, I usually stopped to think about what to write next. I had never spent time planning before taking this writing course. However, as I learned how to write emails effectively in this class, I learned to spend more time in thinking about what I was going to write, how to organize it, and what kind of expressions are appropriate. This was all before I actually started to write. (An anonymous student)

Before I took the writing class, the first thing I did in my writing process was think about what I was going to write, and then translate it into Japanese. However, after I took the class, I began to plan more about how I could convey the content to the reader—especially how I clearly state the purpose of the email first, and then add more details after that. (An anonymous student)

Extracts [7.7] and [7.8] reveal that toward the end of the course, the students learned to pay more attention to global planning before they started to write. However, the quality of this change appears to vary between the two students. Extract [7.7] shows that the student realized the importance of planning at the end of the semester even though s/he had not spent time in planning at the beginning of the semester. Extract [7.8], in contrast, shows that although the student might have spent time for planning at the beginning of the semester, his or her concerns were limited to what the content should be. However, it appears that at the end of the semester, the student’s concerns were expanded to how s/he was going to write and organize the language expressions. It is also notable that the two
students attributed such a change to the instruction they had received, although the instructor had not explicitly taught them to spend time in planning.

The students’ responses to the open-ended question (How do you think you have changed in the way you write emails?) contained implications about their transfer of refined L2 genre knowledge to L1 contexts. Of the 30 students, nine mentioned that they learned to make more conscious attempts to use language in an appropriate manner when they wrote emails in L1 Japanese, particularly when writing to superiors. Yuka and Nae described how their L2 classroom email experience influenced their L1 email writing, as seen in the following extracts.

[7.9]

Although I knew a variety of formulaic expressions in formal Japanese, I was not quite sure which ones I should use and in what ways because my experiences of using those formal expressions had been quite limited. The email-writing experience in English, though, gave me the opportunity to think about how to use the same expressions of requests in formal Japanese. The examples are “shite itadakukoto wa kanou desyouka” (I was wondering if it would be possible for you to…) or “shite itadakereba arigataku zonjimasu” (I’d appreciate it if you could…). (Yuka)

[7.10]

In the English writing class, the teacher often told us to think about how the email may be interpreted by the reader. I came to draw on this knowledge when writing emails in Japanese too, especially when the writing situation is formal. For
example, when writing an email to my professor, I became more conscious of refining my expressions to give him a better impression about myself. Refining expressions depending on the reader is important, whether in English or Japanese, I believe. The writing course made me realize this. (Nae)

Extracts [7.9] and [7.10], along with Extracts [7.1] and [7.2] noted earlier, remind us of the issue of multicompetence, which refers to writers’ reciprocal capacities across their languages (e.g., Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008; Ortega & Carson, 2009; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2009; Roca de Larios, Manchón, & Murphy, 2006; Uysal, 2008; Wang & Wen, 2002; Woodal, 2002). These researchers have provided theoretical and empirical support for the bidirectional interaction of two languages in some aspects of linguistic operations during the process of writing. However, most relevant to the issue reported here is the transfer of genre knowledge. The students’ accounts in Extracts [7.9] and [7.10] indicate that genre knowledge obtained in the L2 context may have an impact on the use of L1 in writing the same genre, whereas Extracts [7.1] and [7.2], in contrast, suggest that inexperienced L2 writers may rely on genre knowledge obtained from their L1 context. These findings are in accordance with Cook’s (2003) notion of multicompetence: people who know more than one language have a distinct compound state of mind called multicompetence, and L2 users are unique in their own right. The findings also suggest that students’ multicompetence might develop only after they recognize the similarities and differences between the L2 and their L1 rhetorical, socio-cultural, and linguistic norms.

The changes in the way the students think about writing an email were also observed in the way they conceptualized the genre, which was revealed in their comments given in
response to the last question in the end-of-semester questionnaire: *Please tell me what constitutes a good email in your opinion. For example, if you write a request email to someone, what kind of things do you think about when writing?* The same question had been asked at the beginning of the semester (see Table 7.2). Table 7.5 summarizes their comments provided at the end of the semester. A total of 45 idea units were identified, and then analyzed to reveal key words commonly used by the students. Next, on the basis of the key words, the ways the students conceptualized the genre were classified into five categories for what a good email should include: (1) a good email should include a clear statement of the purpose of the email (11 cases); (2) the most appropriate expression that best suits the purpose (10 cases); (3) organization that is easy to follow for the reader (9 cases); (4) the most appropriate expression that best suits the reader’s status (8 cases); and (5) necessary information that fulfills the reader’s needs (7 cases).

Table 7.5  The students’ conceptualization of email writing at the end of the semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Clarifying the purpose of the email at the beginning so that the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reader can be ready to read the following sentences.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Searching for the most appropriate expression that best suits the</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Making the message well-organized in a way that is interesting and</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy to follow for the reader.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Searching for the most appropriate expression that best suits the</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Comparison between Tables 7.5 and 7.2 reveals how their conceptualization of the genre changed from the beginning to the end of the semester, which was 15 weeks later. The students’ comments described in Table 7.2 shows that at the beginning of the semester, the students had a relatively implicit and vague understanding of the genre, which was observed in their choice of words to describe their concerns about email writing, such as “writing clearly and concisely” and “making the messages sound polite and humble.” In contrast, as shown in Table 7.5., the students’ concerns about the genre at the end of the semester shifted to more sophisticated, well-informed ones, which appeared in the form of more detailed and more context-oriented comments, such as “clarifying the purpose of the email in the beginning so that the reader can be ready to read the following sentences.” It is notable that these accounts were characterized by the words that can tell the students’ heightened awareness of a rhetorical context, involving the “reader” and the “purpose.” Interestingly, these words did not explicitly appear in the students’ accounts at the beginning of the semester, although they might have been implicitly aware of these social factors. This type of transformation that emerged in the students’ awareness might be a sign that the students began to perceive more responsibility as writers when they engaged in reciprocal interaction tasks.

The following section reports on the extent to which the genre-appropriate rhetorical awareness changes reported above appeared in students’ actual email writing performances and lexicogrammatical choices.
7.2 Longitudinal changes in email-writing performance and lexicogrammatical choices

The changes in the students’ writing performance and lexicogrammatical choices were analyzed on the basis of the genre production data collected from the pre- and post-instructional writing tasks. Due to the small number of participants, it is inappropriate to make any claims of generalizability for the findings. Therefore, the quantitative results must be seen as exploratory in nature, and basically presented for descriptive purposes only. For this reason, inferential statistics were not attempted, and instead the analysis here focuses on comparing group means based on the 95% confidence intervals (CIs) above and below the means for each group.

7.2.1 Holistic scores

To examine how the students’ actual writing performance changed over time, their pre- and post-instructional writing tasks were assessed holistically, using a five-point scale (from 1 = lowest to 5 = highest) on the basis of the TOEIC writing test scoring guidelines (see Appendix A).

Table 7.6 is a summary of the descriptive statistics for the two groups’ holistic scores of email writing tasks at the beginning of the semester (Time 0), and 15 weeks later, at the end of the semester (Time 1). The two groups’ long term changes between Time 0 and Time 1 are illustrated in Figure 7.1.

Two key findings can be drawn from the analysis of the descriptive statistics. First, the two groups’ mean values were similar at the beginning of the semester. The students in
the higher proficiency track scored 1.53 on average out of the maximum possible score of five, with a standard deviation of 0.52. Similarly, those in the lower proficiency track scored 1.13 with a standard deviation of 0.35. Second, both groups of students improved their holistic scores at the end of the semester, but to different degrees. The students at a higher proficiency level showed greater improvement than the lower proficiency group. The higher group scored 4.73 on average with a standard deviation of 0.46, whereas the lower group scored 3.00 with a standard deviation of 0.54. Figure 7.2 illustrates the group differences in the mean values of holistic scores on the basis of the 95% CIs. Note that where the 95% CI areas (surrounding each mean value) overlap with each other, this pattern is indicative of no statistically significant difference, whereas non-overlapping areas indicate a statistically significant difference between the means (p < .05) (Byrnes et al., 2010). In Figure 7.2, the 95% CI values around the mean values for the two groups at Time 0 overlap with each other but do not at Time 1, indicating that both groups of students started off at a similar level in terms of holistic scores, but trustworthy group differences emerged 15 weeks later. It can be argued that the students in the higher proficiency track improved to a larger extent than those in the lower proficiency track and therefore benefited more from the genre-based, task-based email writing course.
Table 7.6  Descriptive statistics for holistic scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Beginning)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Beginning)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1  The two groups’ mean holistic scores at two different time periods
Figure 7. 2 The two groups’ 95% CI values for holistic scores at two different time periods

7.2.2 Fluency and complexity

Besides holistic scores, I investigated the following two constructs as a manifestation of the students’ emerging writing development that might have been impacted by the carefully designed, genre-based tasks and materials: fluency (measured by the total number of words, the total number of T-units, and the total number of clauses) and complexity (measured by the mean length of T-units [MLTU], the mean length of clauses [MLC], and the clauses per T-unit [CTU]). The results are presented in the order described above.
7.2.2.1 Fluency

Table 7.7 provides descriptive evidence of longitudinal change in the students’ fluency of their email writing tasks on the three fluency indices. Figures 7.3 through 7.5 show the two groups’ changes in the total number of words, total number of T-units, and total number of clauses, respectively. Both groups of students wrote much longer texts at the end of the semester, using a larger number of words, T-units, and clauses. However, proficiency effects are visible, first, in the overall shorter emails written by the low group students on both occasions and, second, in the fact that the improvement in writing fluency by the higher-proficiency students was greater on all three fluency indices, compared to the lower-proficiency students (e.g., at the end of the semester, the high group write 201.07 more words on average than in the beginning, whereas the low group wrote 136 more words). Figures 7.6 through 7.8 illustrate the group differences in the mean values of each of the three indices based on the 95% CIs. For each of the three variables, the mean values overlap with each other at Time 0 but do not overlap at Time 1. This indicates that the students at a higher proficiency level wrote significantly longer texts than those at a lower proficiency group at the end of the semester. Overall, it is interesting to find that the two different proficiency groups were similar at the beginning of the course in terms of holistic scores and writing fluency, but proficiency differences created significant differences in these variables at the end of the course.
Table 7.7 Descriptive statistics for fluency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean No. of Words (SD)</th>
<th>Mean No. of T-units (SD)</th>
<th>Mean No. of Clauses (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0 (Beginning)</td>
<td>85.80 (29.77)</td>
<td>9.07 (3.81)</td>
<td>11.27 (4.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (End)</td>
<td>286.87 (69.32)</td>
<td>25.87 (7.90)</td>
<td>36.53 (9.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0 (Beginning)</td>
<td>55.93 (23.97)</td>
<td>5.87 (2.36)</td>
<td>6.93 (3.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (End)</td>
<td>191.93 (53.09)</td>
<td>19.00 (5.14)</td>
<td>24.40 (6.39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.3 The two groups’ mean number of words at two different time periods
Figure 7.4  The two groups’ mean number of T-units at two different time periods

Figure 7.5  The two groups’ mean number of clauses at two different time periods
Figure 7.6 The two groups’ 95% CI values for the mean number of words at two different time periods
Figure 7.7 The two groups’ 95% CI values for the mean number of T-units at two different time periods
Figure 7. 8 The two groups’ 95% CI values for the mean number of clauses at two different time periods

7.2.2.2 Complexity

Table 7.8 provides descriptive evidence of longitudinal change in the students’ complexity in their email-writing tasks on the three complexity measures investigated. The table shows that the changes in complexity was substantially smaller than those in fluency presented above, both in terms of the time and group factors. The 95% CI values around the mean values for each of the three indices are illustrated in Figures 7.9 through 7.11. In Figure 7.9, the 95% CI values for average MLTU for the two groups overlap with each other at the two time periods, which indicates that there is no trustworthy differences between the two proficiency groups in the MLTU values. Overlapping 95% CI values are also observed for the measures of MLC and CTU, as shown in Figures 7.10 and 7.11,
which suggest that there is no significant proficiency effects on complexity of the students’
texts.

Table 7.8  Descriptive statistics for complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean Length of T-unit [MLTU] (SD)</th>
<th>Mean Length of Clause [MLC] (SD)</th>
<th>Clauses per T-unit [CTU] (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0 (Beginning)</td>
<td>9.89 (2.51)</td>
<td>7.74 (1.22)</td>
<td>1.28 (0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (End)</td>
<td>11.06 (1.62)</td>
<td>7.69 (0.66)</td>
<td>1.43 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0 (Beginning)</td>
<td>9.61 (1.70)</td>
<td>8.49 (2.29)</td>
<td>1.18 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (End)</td>
<td>10.26 (1.70)</td>
<td>7.89 (0.85)</td>
<td>1.30 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7. 9  The two groups 95% CI values for MLTU at two different time periods

Figure 7. 10  The two groups’ 95% CI values for MLC at two different time periods
7.2.3 Lexical/grammatical richness

To examine longitudinal change in the students’ writing performance, more local aspects of their texts were analyzed that focused on the changes in their lexicogrammatical choices, and specifically in their lexical and grammatical richness. To do so, lexical density of the students’ texts and their use of interpersonal grammatical metaphors (i.e., metaphorical forms of making requests) and supportive moves were analyzed.

7.2.3.1 Lexical richness as measured by lexical density

Table 7.9 is a summary of descriptive statistics for lexical density of the two groups’
emails written during the two different periods. No substantial changes were seen between the two time periods for either group of students. Figure 7.12 illustrates the comparison of the two groups. The 95% CIs around the mean values overlap with each other, which suggests no significant group differences in terms of lexical density.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0 (Beginning)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (End)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0 (Beginning)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (End)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.12 The two groups 95% CI values for lexical density at two different time periods

7.2.3.2 Grammatical richness as measured by use of interpersonal grammatical metaphors

Since the students in this study were asked to write a request email in formal ways (i.e., the writer-reader relationship was unequal in status and distant in solidarity, see Chapter 2 for dimensions of variation in tenor), grammatical richness was calculated as a raw frequency count of request expressions that were metaphorical and incongruent in SFL’s sense. The SFL’s metaphorical ways of making requests are equivalent to downgraders (Takahashi, 2005; Takimoto, 2006, 2009) in the field of interlanguage
pragmatics—linguistic resources for mitigating the strength of a request. Thus, the target metaphorical expressions were chosen based not only on the SFL literature but also interlanguage pragmatics. Eventually, the following expressions were selected as interpersonal grammatical metaphors for making requests: interrogatives (e.g., *Could you...? Do you think it would be possible...?*) and if-clause (e.g., *I wonder if you could..., I would appreciate it if you could*). As a comparison, I also obtained a frequency count of less metaphorical (i.e., prototypical and common) and less congruent (congruent and direct) expressions in order to compare the students’ language choices made between the two different observation periods. The prototypical, congruent, and direct request expressions were selected with reference to previous literature on interlanguage pragmatics, which have generally reported lower proficiency students’ tendency to choose imperatives (*please...*), obligation statement (*you have to...*), illocutionary verbs (*I am writing to request...*), and *want/need*-based strategies (*I want you to...*) (Achiba, 2003; Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012; Felix-Brasdefer, 2007; Takahashi, 2005; Takimoto, 2006, 2009). I thus focused on these four types of request expressions as an indicator of less-advanced request strategies. More detailed explanations and examples of the coding procedures can be found in Appendix F.

Table 7.10 shows the overall distribution of congruent and incongruent requests employed by individual students for each proficiency level between the two time periods. Each figure in the table shows a raw frequency count of each request type. More details on what forms the students chose for their requests are described in Table 7.11. Following Felix-Brasdefer (2007), in the two tables, the percentage (%) for each request type is followed by the frequency of strategy use (n).

It can be clearly seen that incongruent request forms were almost absent for both
groups of students at the beginning of the semester, regardless of proficiency levels: congruent requestive strategies was the overwhelming preference for both the higher proficiency group (94%) and the lower proficiency group (100%) at Time 0. The students’ heavily reliance on congruent requests at the beginning of the semester is clearly illustrated in Figure 7.13.
Table 7.10 Distribution of request strategies by type, by learner, and for each proficiency level across the two time periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
<th>Incongruent</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
<th>Incongruent</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
<th>Incongruent</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
<th>Incongruent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 0</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 0</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 0</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 0</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time 0 = the beginning of the semester; Time 1 = the end of the semester

Table 7.11 Distribution of request type by two groups between the two different time periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
<th>Incongruent</th>
<th>Imperatives</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Illocutionary</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Interrogatives</th>
<th>If-clause</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time 0 = the beginning of the semester; Time 1 = the end of the semester
Figure 7.13 Overall distribution of request strategies by type and by group across the two different time periods

A closer examination of Table 7.11 revealed that a want-based statement was the most frequent requestive strategy employed by both groups at the beginning of the semester (64% for the higher proficiency group and 82% for the lower proficiency group). In this type of congruent request, the first person singular verb form “I want” and “I hope” was overused by most students, as illustrated in the following examples (7.a), (7.b), (7.c), and (7.d). The expressions to convey a request is underlined, and the group and the ID of the student are indicated in parenthesis.

(7.a) *I hope that the tuition will be decreased.* (Low Group, #4)

(7.b) *I want to study in a nicer and more comfortable environment.* (Low Group, #10)

(7.c) *I want the university to set up a large playground.* (High Group, #1)

(7.d) *I want you to improve cafeteria service.* (High Group, #6)
Other request types frequently chosen by both groups of students were realized with an imperative, and most were modified by the marker “please,” as shown in the following examples (7.e), (7.f), (7.g), and (7.h).

(7.e) Please create a non-smoking area. (Low Group, #7)
(7.f) Please increase the number of street lamps in the city (Low Group, #10)
(7.g) Please set up a bike parking for students. (High Group, #6)
(7.h) Please make a larger study room! (High Group, #8)

In this way, both groups of students were very similar in their requestive strategies at the beginning of the semester. Irrespective of proficiency levels, the students generally chose less metaphorical, congruent request forms in response to the task prompt. However, proficiency effects were eventually observed in their meaning-making choices at the end of the semester. The use of these congruent request forms decreased sharply in the higher proficiency group (from 64% to 17% for want-based statement; from 20% to 5% for imperatives with the marker please), but the lower proficiency group’s reliance on congruent forms did not demonstrate such changes (from 10% to 9% for imperatives; from 82% to 57% for want-based statement). Importantly, the higher proficiency group demonstrated greater grammatical resources when making a polite request, with a shift to a preference for more incongruent requests, as seen in the following examples (7.i), (7.j), (7.k), and (7.l).
(7.i) *I’d appreciate it if you could allow us to control the air conditioner to make a room more comfortable for students.* (High Group, #3)

(7.j) *Do you think that it would be possible to create a car parking and permit the students to go to school by car?* (High Group, #5)

(7.k) *I wonder if you could tell the student office staff to behave themselves.* (High Group, #7)

(7.l) *Would it be possible to prepare individual lockers for students?* (High Group, # 9)

As seen in these examples, the advanced students show a productive use of the pragmalinguistic forms necessary to perform a conventional formal request, utilizing if-clauses and interrogatives. It should be noted that “I wonder if” (30%) and “I’d appreciate it if” (30%) occurred more frequently than the other options in the higher proficiency students. However, these incongruent polite request forms were less frequently used in the lower proficiency group. Congruent requests in the form of want-based statements still predominated (57%) in the lower proficiency students, although the range of their request types increased slightly over time.

The more productive use of incongruent request expressions by the advanced students, which are characterized by more subordinate clauses, helps explain the reason why the lexical density did not exhibit differences. Incongruent request forms, such as “I wonder if” and “I’d appreciate it if,” contain more subordinate clauses, which are not lexical but structural characteristics of a composition (Laufer & Nation, 1995). Thus, more subordination within a text might lead to more grammatically-intricate but less lexically-dense textual features.
7.2.3.3 Grammatical richness in generic schematic structure: Supportive moves

Not only linguistic features but also structural moves play a role in mitigating or emphasizing the force of the actual request. From the perspective of SFL’s predictions for ontogenetic development of lexicogrammatical choices, therefore, it is informative to identify whether and how such structural moves were utilized by the students to articulate the communicative purpose of a request (Felix-Brasdefer, 2007) in their email writing choices. Following Felix-Brasdefer (2007) and Al-Ali (2008) (see 6.4.5.1), I investigated the strategic moves employed by the students and categorized the moves they used into the following seven components: opening, identifying self, requesting, giving reasons and explanations, summarizing, ending politely, and closing. Table 7.12 summarizes the examples of each move.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Opening       | *Dear University Improvement Committee,*  
                     *To whom it may concern,*                                                   |
| 2. Identifying self | *I am (x) from (y) University.*  
                     *My name is (x) and I am a sophomore at (y) university.*                  |
| 3. Requesting    | *I am writing you to request for improvement of the cafeteria.*  
                     *Would it be possible to lower university tuition?*                      |
| 4. Giving reasons| *I am unsatisfied with the space. I cannot find a seat when I enter the cafeteria.*  
                     *The number of courses offered to sophomore students is limited.*  
                     *This doesn’t deserve a higher tuition.*                                |
| 5. Summarizing   | *These three are my requests. I think these are very important for the university to improve its environment.*  
                     *The above are my requests. If you consider my requests, this*          |
Table 7.1 shows the percentage of the overall emails that contained each structural move between the two time periods. As shown in Table 7.13, at the beginning of the semester, there was minimal use of supportive moves across the different proficiency level groups at the beginning of the semester. Of these, requesting was primarily employed by both groups. Yet, this might be a natural result since the purpose of the task was writing a request email. The small percentage of occurrence of each move prior to email writing instruction indicates that, as seen in the rhetorical awareness data, the students’ knowledge of the genre was quite limited, and fewer strategies were available to them to externally modify a request. For example, although opening and closing are conventional devices often employed in any type of written correspondence, the percentage of occurrence of these devices at Time 0 was small (53% for the higher proficiency group and 33% for the lower proficiency group). Similar results were observed when identifying oneself (33% for both groups) and ending politely (13% for the higher proficiency group and 20% for the lower proficiency group). It is of particular interest to note that the percentage of occurrence of grounders (giving reasons and explanations) was likewise very small in their pre-instructional email texts (33% for the higher proficiency group and 20% for the lower proficiency group), even though these moves are essential strategies for supporting a request and making a claim more persuasive to the reader. The findings indicate that prior
to the genre-based instruction the students might have been unaware of what they were expected to write and how they responded to the task prompt. The students’ limited understanding of the genre expectations is described in the following examples (7.m) and (7.n).

(7.m)

_I have two requests. First, I wish that Atsugi city improves its heavy traffic areas. Second, I hope that Atsugi city builds theaters, museums, and shopping malls._

(High Group, #9)

(7.n)

_Hello. I have two requests. First, I hope that the city does something to keep the station clean. Second, I hope that new shops and restaurants are opened._

(Low Group, #8)

The two examples above suggest that the students might have written these emails in the same manner as expository essays (opinion stating) without fully considering the genre expectations, which includes what the intended audience’s needs are, the purpose of the task, and the lexicogrammatical resources that are optimally appropriate to achieve the goal. This assumption appears to correspond to the students’ comments in Extracts [7.3], [7.4], and [7.5], presented earlier in the rhetorical awareness data.

In those Extracts [7.3], [7.4], and [7.5], the students also commented that the classroom activities and tasks helped them to gain a better understanding of the genre
conventions and change the aspects they once focused on when writing. It appears that the increasing rhetorical awareness captured in the self-reported data affected the way they wrote the genre, in that it might have led to more productive use of the genre-specific lexicogrammatical resources by the end of the semester. As shown in Table 7.13, compared with the beginning of the semester, the percentage in the strategic structural moves utilized by the students increased sharply on the post-instruction email writing task, and this was true for each type of move and for both groups. This indicates that by the end of the semester-long genre-based instruction more varied moves had become available to both groups to modify, mitigate, or emphasize a request.

Table 7.13 The percentage of component moves that appeared in the students’ request emails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Component moves of request emails</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openin</td>
<td>Identifying</td>
<td>Requesting</td>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>Ending politely</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time 0 = the beginning of the semester; Time 1 = the end of the semester
7.3 Summary

This chapter examined how the students, as a whole and when compared across the two different proficiency levels, developed their genre-appropriate rhetorical awareness and knowledge, and how their overall writing performance as well as their lexicogrammatical choices changed as they engaged in systematically designed, genre-based writing tasks that incorporated email writing. The results obtained from the questionnaires, free-writing reflections, and interviews indicated that the experience with the email writing task-based instruction resulted in the development of rhetorical awareness and knowledge along two important factors: improved knowledge of genre-specific language choices and enhanced audience awareness. As the students continually engaged in various types of genre-based tasks, they appeared to have developed a keener awareness of the external context that involved the audience of a text and gained a more explicit understanding of how language was used accordingly. Interestingly, the changes in their genre-informed rhetorical awareness affected the quality of planning and the way they wrote the same genre in their L1 Japanese. These qualitative changes in the level of awareness were observed for both the higher and lower proficiency groups.

Analysis of the students’ texts showed that the students made clear gains in certain aspects of their writing performance. Comparison of the pre- and post-instructional writing task scores revealed that the overall quality of the students’ writing improved for both groups in terms of holistic score, fluency, and structural moves employed to achieve the goal of the genre. That is, compared to the beginning of the semester, both the higher and lower proficiency groups were more fluent in writing an email by the end of the semester,
while using more varied moves. Although speculative, both increased fluency and richer moves may have been associated with the observed improvement of their holistic scores. It is important to note, however, that the higher proficiency group showed larger gains in these two variables than the lower proficiency group. It is also important to emphasize here that in terms of grammatical richness as indexed in the use of interpersonal metaphor, only the higher proficiency group showed noticeable changes. This was characterized by a shift from their reliance on prototypical, congruent, and direct genre expressions (e.g., *I want you to..., please...*) to their reliance on more metaphorical, incongruent, and mitigated genre expressions (e.g., *I wondered if..., I’d appreciate it if*...). The lower proficiency group, on the other hand, did not exhibit such changes in their meaning-making choices. They still continued to choose prototypical, congruent, and direct expressions to respond to the task prompt despite having experienced the same materials and tasks targeting the same explicit pedagogical aims for genre development.

In summary, three important findings can be drawn from the analysis. First, the students, irrespective of their proficiency levels, might have benefited from the SFL-inspired instruction in terms of perceived knowledge and awareness of the email writing genre and its rhetorical make-up. This included improved knowledge of genre-specific language choices and enhanced audience awareness. Second, their perceived changes of rhetorical knowledge might have affected the way they actually produced, which might have resulted in the improvement of the quality of their actual writing products in terms of holistic scores, fluency, and structural moves. Lastly, although both proficiency groups improved their genre awareness and overall writing performance, the degree of the improvement varied depending on their linguistic proficiency levels. The
students in the higher proficiency track made more gains in all the variables mentioned above, and this proficiency effect was the most evident in their lexicogrammatical choices for interpersonal metaphor use. That is, it was the higher proficiency students only who began to demonstrate more productive and expanded use of the genre-specific requestive strategies over time, with more varied, more incongruent and metaphorical grammatical resources, where at the beginning of the semester they had limited themselves, just as often as the lower proficiency students, to only congruent and prototypical lexicogrammatical resources.
CHAPTER 8
LONGITUDINAL CHANGES IN THE SECOND SEMESTER: SUMMARY WRITING

This chapter deals with the question of how the EFL writers learned summary writing in the second half of the one-year genre-based writing course (The first half of the course dealt with email writing, as have been reported in Chapter 7). Specifically, this chapter addresses how the genre-based, task-based instruction helped the students respond to the demands of summary writing, which were significantly different from those of email writing with which they had been familiar in the first half of the course. This chapter then describes how the students developed “new ways of using language” (Colombi & Schleppegrell, 2002, p. 10)—ways that enabled them to meet the demands of the academic genre.

The findings are reported in the following order. First, the changes in the students’ awareness and understanding of summary writing are presented on the basis of their rhetorical awareness data. The findings address the students’ prior experiences of writing summaries in English, how they conceptualized summary writing at the initial stage of the instruction, and how their initial conceptualization of summarization changed as they progressed through the course. Second, the changes in their overall summarizing performances and lexicogrammatical choices are analyzed and presented on the basis of their genre production data at the beginning and end of the second semester. This second set of findings is used to complement the rhetorical awareness data to explore whether and how their inner conceptualization of the genre is reflected in their actual meaning-making.
choices and production of the genre. As each finding is presented throughout the chapter, individual writers’ longitudinal changes are compared between the two different proficiency levels to investigate whether and how writers at the two different proficiency levels within the same course population may have used and benefited from systematically-designed genre based tasks and materials differently.

8.1 Longitudinal changes in genre-specific rhetorical awareness

Table 8.1 summarizes the students’ self-assessment of their prior summarizing experiences, which was given at the beginning of the semester (April, 2010). The first question was: To what extent do/did you have the opportunities to summarize what you read in English? As shown in Table 8.1, all the students chose “Not at all,” which suggests that the students in both groups enrolled in the writing course with no prior experiences of summary writing in English.
Table 8.1 The students’ self-assessment of prior summarizing experiences

1. To what extent do/did you have the opportunities to summarize what you read in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Have you even been taught how to write summaries in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High group (N = 15), Low Group (N = 15); Likert scale 1 = never, 2 = not very often, 3 = somewhat often, 4 = very often

Their limited understanding of summarization was also apparent in their responses to the open-ended reflection question: In your opinion, what are the most important things to remember when you are summarizing a text that you have read? (adapted from Wette, 2010). Table 8.2 summarizes their comments. Of the answers identified, “extracting a gist” predominated throughout their answers (14 cases), followed by “making content more concise” (10 cases). These comments indicate that the students’ concerns about summarization at the beginning of the course were more content-oriented (i.e., what is said, related to the field) than language itself (i.e., how it is said, related to the tenor and mode). It is also important to note that some students wrote “I have no idea” (6 cases). This finding might reflect that they had difficulties when specifying rules or conventions that they
believed were important for summary writing.

Table 8. 2 The students’ conceptualization of summary writing at the beginning of the semester

*In your opinion, what are the most important things to remember when you are summarizing a text that you have read?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Extracting a gist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Making content concise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) I have no idea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another important point is that certain students who responded “I have no idea” referred to their summarizing experiences in their L1, emphasizing the fact that they were not even confident in their summarizing ability in Japanese. They commonly mentioned that their limited L1 prior experiences made it difficult for them to write an adequate summary in another language, as seen in the following extracts (the original responses were in L1 Japanese and I provide English translations for readers’ ease).

[8.1]

*I’ve never consciously considered this type of question before, whether in English or Japanese. So, I have no idea how to answer this question right now. I think that as long as I am unsure about how to write a summary in Japanese, it will*
be the same for English. (An anonymous student)

[8.2]

I am not quite sure how to answer this question because I don’t remember being formally taught about any rules in summary writing either in my English classes or my Kokugo (L1 Japanese) classes. I don’t think I can write a good summary in my native language, which probably means that I cannot write a good summary in a foreign language. (An anonymous student)

The relationship between a limited L1 summarizing experience and a vague understanding of the genre was referred to by other students during the interviews. The following reflections were provided by Yoshi and Yuka at the end of the semester.

[8.3]

All I remember regarding my summary experience was reading comprehension quizzes in my Kokugo (L1 Japanese) exams, where I was asked to choose the best summary of the article I had just read. I had never written summaries on my own from scratch and was totally at a loss when I was asked to write one in English during this course. I had no idea how to begin and organize the information, although I knew the purpose of a summary was to explain a key point. (Yoshi)

[8.4]
When it comes to summary writing experiences, I just remember writing a summary of a short story that I read in elementary school. Since then, I did not have any opportunity of writing a summary and have never been taught how to write one until I took this course. I thought that writing a summary of a short story was not the same as writing one for an academic article. I also believed that writing a summary in English was different from writing one in Japanese. My summarizing experience in elementary school did not prepare me to write summaries in English. (Yuka)

In Extracts [8.3] and [8.4], Yoshi and Yuka described that although they had had some previous experiences related to the genre in their L1, those experiences did not help them to write the genre in L2 due to the different task demands and expectations. The accounts provided by Yoshi and Yuka, along with those given by the two anonymous students in Extracts [8.1] and [8.2], indicate that FL writers might try to recall their L1 genre experiences or genre schemata, if they have no tools to rely on when writing the same genre in L2. This suggests the possibility that the knowledge of a genre gained in one language context might be transferrable to another language context. However, for the transfer to occur successfully across two languages, their L1 genre schemata might need to be firmly established. The students’ accounts presented in Extracts [8.1] through [8.4] suggest that due to their lack of genre knowledge of summarization in L1, they might have failed to direct their attention when asked to write the genre in L2.

Next, Table 8.3 shows the results of the self-assessment questionnaire conducted at the end of the semester. The first question was: To what degree do you think that you have improved your ability to write summaries in English? The results suggest that the higher
proficiency group generally evaluated their improvement positively (M = 2.73), while the lower proficiency students tended to assess themselves less positively (M = 1.93). It was interesting that such proficiency difference on self-evaluation was also observed in their perception of their email writing experiences (see Chapter 7, section 7.1).

The second question of the semester-end questionnaire was: To what degree do you think that you have changed your way of thinking about writing summaries in English?

Table 8.3 shows that none of the students responded to this question negatively, which means that changes were perceived to a certain extent by each of the students, regardless of their English proficiency levels. This finding shows that although the lower proficiency students generally underestimated the level of their summarizing skills, they perceived that something changed in their views on the genre. This tendency was also identified in their perception of their email writing experiences by the end of the first semester.

Table 8.3  The students’ perception of their development as L2 summarizers

1. To what degree do you think that you have improved your ability to write summaries in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what degree do you think that you have changed your way of thinking about writing summaries in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To explore how and why the students thought they had changed their way of thinking about writing summaries in English, the following open-ended question was provided: *For those students who chose either “a little,” “somewhat,” or “a lot” in the second question, how and why do you think you have changed in the way you did?* Table 8.4 summarizes the students’ answers regarding how they changed. A total of 39 idea units were identified in the students’ accounts, after which they were analyzed to identify key words and were then classified into the following five categories: The students began to pay more attention to (1) finding different language expressions to describe the original meaning (14 cases); (2) refining expressions to make them more academic and sophisticated (9 cases); (3) using reporting verbs (7 cases); (4) controlling the depth of information (5 cases); and (5) making the structure more reader-friendly (4 cases). These comments show that the aspects that the students focused on while summarizing changed from those at the beginning of the semester. As described in Table 8.2 above, at the beginning of the semester, the students were more content-oriented (i.e., what is said), such as “getting a gist” and “making the original information shorter.” At the end of the semester, however, two important concerns emerged from the students. First, the students’ attention shifted toward linguistic aspects (i.e., how it is said, or the textual functions), as represented in such comments as “using different expressions to describe the original meaning,” “refining expressions so that they sound academic,” and “using reporting verbs.” Second, the students became more concerned with the appropriate level of information depth and the reader-friendly
organization, as represented in comments such as “controlling the depth of information” and “making the structure more reader-friendly.” This finding indicates that the students might have become more aware of the genre expectations, the rhetorical demands and needs of their audience.

Table 8.4 The students’ comments about how they have changed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Finding different language expressions without changing the original meaning.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Refining my expressions so that they sound more academic and sophisticated.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Using reporting verbs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Controlling the depth of the necessary information.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Considering the structure so that the reader can follow it easily.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes in the students’ concerns about summarization were also demonstrated in their answers to the last open-ended question in the questionnaire: *What do you now know about summarizing a text that you didn’t know before taking this course?* Table 8.5 summarizes the students’ answers. The table shows that prior to taking this course, the majority of the students had not been aware of the concept of plagiarism (23 cases), nor were they aware of the convention to acknowledge the source author’s original ideas by using reporting verbs (17 cases). Interestingly, many of the students explained that they had
not even heard the term, hyoosetsu, a Japanese term for plagiarism. These findings imply that the students might have held inappropriate beliefs about or conceptualizations of summary writing, which judging from other answers on the questionnaire had been most likely shaped by limited L1 experiences during the early school years well before they experienced summary writing in the course. The following extracts indicate this possibility. These accounts were provided by anonymous students in response to the free-writing exercise conducted in Week 3, after they engaged in their first summary writing assignment. The prompt was: How did you start writing your first summary writing assignment? Tell me what you were thinking about while you wrote it.

[8.5]

Picking a topic sentence from each paragraph and putting them together—this is the way I summarized the article. (An anonymous student)

[8.6]

My English teacher in high school taught me that a paragraph is the basic unit of writing in English and extracting a topic sentence from each paragraph helps us get a gist of the entire passage. I simply followed this rule when I wrote this summary. (An anonymous student)

These comments show that the concept of a topic sentence might have served as a major tool for students to rely on when they engaged in their first summary writing assignment. This finding also indicates the possibility that the students might have interpreted
summarization as merely a shortened version of the original text.

The following extracts show how the beliefs observed at the initial stage of the course (defining summary as a shortened version of the original text) might have been transformed by the genre-based tasks they experienced in class. The extracts come from the free-writing exercises conducted in Week 13, after the students completed their sixth summary writing assignment. The prompt was: How did you start writing your sixth summary writing assignment? Tell me about any noticeable changes, compared to the beginning of the semester.

[8.7]
I feel that I started to pay more attention to rewording. Before taking this class, I did not know about the concept of plagiarism, and so all I did was just copying original sentences that sounded important and putting them together. (An anonymous student)

[8.8]
I did not know that copying the original sentence was like stealing the author’s ideas. Plagiarism and hyoosetsu are truly new concepts to me. (An anonymous student)

[8.9]
I learned that expressions, such as “this article describes...,” “the author explains...,” and “according to the author,” are quite important when summarizing source information because these expressions can help show that the
information was not my idea but someone else’s. (An anonymous student)

The three extracts presented above show that these students came to realize that drawing on the conventions shaped by their previous experiences or former teachers was not helpful in the new writing context. In addition, they also realized that their previous knowledge was not very helpful to respond to the expectation of the given task within that context. Extracts [8.7] and [8.8] illustrate that the two students learned the new concept of plagiarism and the importance of rewording. Extract [8.9] describes that the student came to realize the need to use reporting verbs to differentiate his or her own ideas from someone else’s.

Table 8.5 The elements of the genre that the students found new

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) the concept of plagiarism (including ‘hoyoosetsu*’), the need to rephrase original sentences</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) reporting verbs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) controlling the depth of the summarized information, depending on the reader</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) the concept of thesis statement and supporting ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*hoyoosetsu (剽竊) *a Japanese term for plagiarism

Other notable comments in response to the open-ended question were related to the students’ awareness of the reader (4 cases). The students’ comments indicated the possible
effects of the genre-based tasks that they experienced in class. The SFL-based summary writing tasks and materials were characterized by an analysis of sample summaries that focused on interactions of purpose (ideational), audience (interpersonal) and linguistic choices (textual) (see Chapter 6, section 6.4). The students’ reflections showed that these tasks and materials might have helped them to focus attention on the rhetorical context in which they summarized, as illustrated in the following extracts.

[8.10]
This course taught me that types of summaries differ according to who the reader is and what the reader needs. This is quite a fundamental convention that is applicable to whatever genres we write, yet I have never consciously paid attention to this convention before. (An anonymous student)

[8.11]
I learned that taking into consideration the reader’s background and his or her needs is important to write an effective summary. I also recognized the importance of considering the reader’s needs through the experience of writing a summary of the short article for junior students who might have been unfamiliar with the topic. It was really fun explaining what I knew to someone else who didn’t know what I did. (An anonymous student)

A closer examination of the two extracts offers two important implications regarding inexperienced writers’ genre learning. First, it appears that these students attribute their
change to their improved awareness of the audience. Second, paying attention to the audience from their own perspective might be difficult for novice writers. In Extract [8.10], the student described that she or he had not \textit{consciously} paid attention to the reader until they had received external input, although she might have known unconsciously that it was important to take the reader’s needs into consideration. The findings imply that genre knowledge might exist in the different levels of consciousness, and hence students need external goals and input so that they can bring their implicit knowledge up to a higher level of consciousness.

Overall, on the basis of the rhetorical awareness data, it can be argued that the two important factors—writers’ refined awareness of language choices and their heightened awareness of audience—might play a key role in the students’ perception of their own changes in rhetorical awareness, regardless of their linguistic proficiency levels. It is interesting to note that these factors were also observed in the analysis of their email writing experiences reported in the previous chapter.

The next section presents how the changes in the students’ awareness and knowledge of the genre were reflected in their actual summarizing performances and lexicogrammatical choices.

8.2 \textbf{Longitudinal changes in summarizing performance and lexicogrammatical choices}

The longitudinal changes in the students’ summarizing performances and lexicogrammatical choices are analyzed based on the data collected from the pre-instructional and post-instructional summarizing tasks. As mentioned in Chapter 7, the
small number of participants makes it difficult to generalize the findings, and therefore the quantitative results must be seen as exploratory in nature and are presented for descriptive purposes only. The degree of the two groups’ (the higher proficiency and the lower proficiency groups) changes was investigated by comparing group means based on the 95% confidence intervals (CIs) above and below the means for each group.

8.2.1 Holistic scores

In order to examine how the students’ actual summarizing performances changed over time, their pre-instructional baseline summarizing task and post-instructional summarizing task were assessed holistically, using a five-point scale (1=lowest; 5=highest) based on the TOEFL writing test scoring guidelines (see Appendix B).

Table 8.6 summarizes descriptive statistics for the two groups’ holistic scores of summary-writing tasks between the beginning of the semester (Time 0), and 15 weeks later, at the end of the semester (Time 1). The table demonstrates that although both groups of students were very similar in their holistic scores at the beginning of the semester, the higher proficiency group demonstrated more substantial gains than the lower proficiency group at the end of the semester. Figure 8.1 illustrates this comparison. The group differences in holistic scores are clearly illustrated in Figure 8.2. The figure shows that although the two groups’ 95% CI values overlap with each other at Time 0 (i.e., no trustworthy differences between the two groups), clear overlapping CI values between the two groups are observed at Time 1 (i.e., a trustworthy difference between the two groups). The findings show that while both groups were similar in their holistic scores at the
beginning of the course, the students at a higher proficiency level outperformed those at a lower proficiency level at the end of the semester.

Table 8.6 Mean holistic scores at the two observation periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.1 The two groups’ holistic scores at two different time periods
8.2.2  Fluency and complexity

Besides analyzing the changes in holistic scores, this study focused on the variables of fluency and complexity as a manifestation of the changes in the overall quality of their summaries. Fluency was measured by total number of words, total number of T-units, and total number of clauses, while complexity was measured by mean length of T-units (MLTU), mean length of clause (MLC), and clause per T-unit (CTU). The results are presented in the order described above.

8.2.2.1 Fluency

Table 8.7 provides descriptive characteristics of longitudinal changes in the students’ fluency in their summary-writing tasks on the three indices investigated. The table demonstrates that both groups of students’ fluency improved substantially over time in terms of the mean number of words, T-units, and clauses. It is worth emphasizing, however, that the degree of improvement differed depending on the students’ language proficiency
levels. As shown in Figures 8.2 through 8.4, advanced students produced much longer texts than lower proficiency students, and this was true for all three fluency measures. The group differences in each of the three variables are illustrated in Figures 8.5 through 8.7. The CI values for words, T-units, and clauses overlap with each other on the pre-instructional task, indicating that there are no significant differences between the two groups. However, the post-instructional tasks demonstrate no overlapping CI values between the higher and the lower proficiency groups, suggesting trustworthy proficiency effects on the students’ writing fluency.

Table 8.7 Descriptive statistics for fluency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean No. of Words (SD)</th>
<th>Mean No. of T-units (SD)</th>
<th>Mean No. of Clauses (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0 (Beginning)</td>
<td>104.33 (33.65)</td>
<td>7.67 (2.19)</td>
<td>11.60 (4.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (End)</td>
<td>193.53 (33.92)</td>
<td>13.07 (3.62)</td>
<td>19.80 (4.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0 (Beginning)</td>
<td>95.87 (31.76)</td>
<td>7.00 (3.02)</td>
<td>10.93 (4.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (End)</td>
<td>141.53 (32.58)</td>
<td>13.07 (3.62)</td>
<td>15.53 (3.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8. 3  The two groups’ mean number of words at two different time periods

Figure 8. 4  The two groups’ mean number of T-units at two different time periods

Figure 8. 5  The two groups’ mean number of clauses at two different time periods
Figure 8. 6 The two groups’ 95% CI values for the mean number of words at two different time periods

Figure 8. 7 The two groups’ 95% CI values for the mean number of T-units at two different time periods
Figure 8. The two groups’ 95% CI values for the mean number of clauses at two different time periods

8.2.2.2 Complexity

The descriptive statistics for the changes in complexity for MLTU, MLC, and CTU are presented in Table 8.8. It is worthwhile noting in passing that the overall levels of complexity elicited by the summary writing are generally higher than those yielded by the email writing (see Table 7.8). This suggests summary writing is overall a more demanding
writing task, something that is also supported by the academic nature of summarizing versus the more oral-like nature of email writing, even for the purposes of a formal request. At the same time, however, the levels of complexity tapped by the task do not seem to differ greatly by proficiency level, in that the two groups are similar to each other in their complexity values on the pre-instruction summary writing, on the one hand, and also on the post-instruction one.

Table 8.8 shows that there were fewer changes in the three indices of complexity between the two observation periods for both groups, compared with those of fluency. The 95% CI values for MLTU, MLC, and CTU are shown in Figures 8.9, 8.10, and 8.11, respectively. As illustrated in the three figures, the CI values around the mean values of each variable do overlap with each other, suggesting no significant differences between the two groups in terms of complexity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.8 Descriptive statistics for complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8. 9  The two groups’ 95% CI values for MLTU at two different time periods

Figure 8. 10  The two groups’ 95% CI values for MLC at two different time periods
8.2.3 Lexical/grammatical richness

In order to complement the above findings associated with fluency and complexity, the analysis delved into more local aspects of the students’ summarizing performances: their lexicogrammatical choices to reword the source information. To this end, the analysis focused on the following three variables: lexical density, the proportion of paraphrased clauses, and grammatical sophistication (i.e., frequency counts of ideational grammatical metaphors). The findings are reported in this order.

8.2.3.1 Lexical richness as measured by lexical density

Table 8.9 shows the changes in lexical density values in the students’ summarizing tasks produced at two different time periods. The table demonstrates that both groups of students wrote more lexically dense summaries at the end of the semester than at the beginning of the semester. As illustrated in Figure 8.12, the 95% CI values for lexical density exhibited an overlap between the two groups. The results suggest that the students’
summaries after instruction contained more dense information with more lexical items or content words per clause than those before instruction, irrespective of their English proficiency levels.

Table 8.9 Descriptive statistics for lexical density at two different time periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2.3.2 Grammatical richness as measured by the proportion of paraphrased clauses

Given the students’ limited understanding of summary writing conventions (e.g., the notion of plagiarism and the functions of reporting verbs) observed at the initial stage of the research period, another important issue to be investigated is the degree to which the students attempted to reword and/or paraphrase the original meaning in their summaries, and how their attempted paraphrases changed over time. To do so, I focused on the changes in the proportion of paraphrased clauses contained in individual students’ summaries between the two periods, calculated as \[
\frac{\text{total number of paraphrased clauses}}{\text{total number of clauses}}\]

As explained in Chapter 5, the paraphrased clause was defined as a clause that contained attempted paraphrase based on Keck (2006): “an instance in which a writer selects a specific excerpt of a source text and makes at least one attempt to change the language of the selected excerpt” (Keck, 2006, p. 263).
The results are summarized in Table 8.10. The table shows that at the beginning of the semester, both groups of students tended to quote the original author’s words verbatim—only for about half of the total number of clauses were there any attempts at transforming or paraphrasing by both groups (53% for the higher proficiency group; 45% for the lower proficiency group). It appears that the students’ reliance on direct duplication reflects the lack of their understanding of plagiarism. Looking at the students’ performances at the end of the semester, however, the proportion of paraphrased clauses demonstrates a dramatic increase for both groups, although steeper for the higher proficiency group (90%, representing an average mean gain of 37% more paraphrased clauses) than the lower proficiency group (68%, which represents a 23% mean increase).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The marked improvement in the proportion of the paraphrased clauses might be a reflection of their increased awareness of the concept of plagiarism and their increased attention to language choices and the reader’s needs. That is, as the students gained an understanding of the conventions of the genre, they might have begun to pay attention to transforming the original meaning in a way that they could avoid the charge of plagiarism. In other words, the students’ new awareness of the genre expectations might have caused a repositioning of goals, both of which might have affected the ways in which they actually wrote the genre.

8.2.3.3 Grammatical richness as measured by use of ideational grammatical metaphors

The previous section reported that the proportion of the clauses paraphrased by the students exhibited a significant rise after instruction. However, these findings do not offer details into the quality of their paraphrasing performances—the degree of grammatical richness of each paraphrased clause. To investigate grammatical richness of their meaning-making choices, thus, I focused on ideational grammatical metaphors created by the students—one of the major meaning-making options employed to express entire proposition of the source text in a compressed manner in summary writing (Drury, 1991). Indeed, previous SFL studies have shown that effective summarization is characterized by the use of nominal phrases or ideational grammatical metaphors that enables the reduction, generalization, and integration of the source information in a way that avoids plagiarism (Drury, 1991; Hood, 2008; Ryshina-Pankova, 2006, 2010).

Four types of ideational grammatical metaphors that are generally referred to as
nominalizations were selected for analysis since summarizing scientific contexts is “thing”-oriented (Schlepegrell, 2004b): (1) Type 1: shift from quality to thing; Type 2: shift from process to thing; Type 3: shift from circumstance to thing; and Type 4: shift from relator to thing (see Chapter 5 for more details, and particularly Table 5.8 there with examples; see also Appendix G for coding procedures and illustrations from the data). Focusing on these four types of ideational grammatical metaphors, the degree of grammatical richness was analyzed by calculating the proportion of grammatical metaphor occurrence per paraphrased clause.

Table 8.11 summarizes the changes in the mean ratio of grammatical metaphor occurrences per paraphrased clause in the summarized texts written by the students at two different proficiency levels. The table highlights notable changes demonstrated by the higher proficiency group in terms of the degree to which they relied on grammatical metaphors in their summaries by the end of the semester. Although both groups of students used fewer grammatical metaphors in their summaries at the beginning of the course, the students at a higher proficiency level demonstrated a sharp increase in the use of grammatical metaphors in their summaries at the end of the course (from a meager 16% to a sizable 50%, representing a 34% mean increase). The students at a lower proficiency level, in contrast, exhibited a slight decrease in their use of grammatical metaphors (from 23% to 17%, or 6% mean decrease), and overall exhibited minimal use of ideational metaphor on both Time 0 and 1. Figure 8.13 illustrates the changes in the use of ideational grammatical metaphors in the two groups’ summaries produced at two different time periods.
Table 8.11 The mean percentage of grammatical metaphor occurrence per paraphrased clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Beginning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(End)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Beginning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(End)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.13 Overall distribution of grammatical metaphors employed by group across the two different periods
8.2.3.4 In-depth analysis of the students’ use of ideational grammatical metaphors

The previous section highlighted significant improvement of grammatical sophistication made only by the higher proficiency group based on the data about frequency of occurrence of grammatical metaphors in their summaries. However, the occurrence of grammatical metaphor alone does not contribute to the effectiveness of summarized texts (Halliday, 1998). Thus, this section focuses on how the students used grammatical metaphors in their summaries and what kinds of meaning they attempted to make by creating grammatical metaphors—semiotic functions of the grammatical metaphors that the students relied on to summarize the source information. The example sentences that contained grammatical metaphors were collected from the higher proficiency group because there were few occurrences of grammatical metaphors in the summaries written by the lower proficiency group, who tended to rephrase the original meaning in a more congruent way (e.g., synonym).

Each of the examples was analyzed qualitatively, and grammatical metaphors utilized by each student were categorized based on their functions. Consequently, two major functions of grammatical metaphors were identified: generalization and reasoning (Halliday, 1994, 1998). Below I examine how the two functions were expressed by the students. In all illustrations, the student’s name is specified in parenthesis, if he or she is the participant who cooperated with a follow-up interview. Otherwise, the student’s ID is presented in parenthesis.

8.2.3.4.1 Generalization

The following two extracts, which were written by Keiko and Ryuichi, show that the
students used grammatical metaphors in order to compress the author’s points from the two original sentences into a shorter phrase, which resulted in forming a technical term in the field of biology. The original sentence is presented first, and then the summarized sentence follows.

(8a)
The original sentence:
Plant geneticists are able to produce new species of food plants by special treatment. (…) Genetic engineering is also important for improving the quality of farm animals.

The summarized sentence:
*In this article, the author describes the development of biotechnology and its effects on plant and animal breeding.* (Keiko)

(8b)
The original sentence:
Genetic engineering is also important for improving the quality of farm animals. For example, breeders are able to use hormones to get prize cows to produce hundreds of eggs.

The summarized sentence:
*The article shows that high quality cows can be produced by means of artificial insemination.* (Ryuichi)
Importantly, both students commented during the follow-up interview that they had not known those technical terms in English (i.e., *plant and animal breeding, artificial insemination*) used in Extracts (8a) and (8b), but had known those biological concepts in Japanese. In other words, the students had not known how to make meaning linguistically, but had known how to make meaning conceptually. Keiko and Ryuichi therefore relied on Japanese to create a technical term first, and then translated it into its English version by consulting a dictionary. Their reliance on Japanese at the initial phase of the meaning construction suggests that the process of creating grammatical metaphor in FL might be related to the degree to which students are familiar with disciplinary knowledge or discipline-based terminology in their L1.

Grammatical metaphor also came into play as a global topic and a thesis statement of the source. Summary writing, in essence, requires writers to report in a condensed form what the article is about in the initial part of the text (Drury, 1991). The students’ summary writing in this study confirmed the effectiveness of using grammatical metaphor for this purpose. The following extracts illustrate how the students utilized grammatical metaphors to create a thesis statement.

(8c)

*In this article, the author describes the relationship between the roles of biotechnology and agriculture and food industry.* (Eri)

(8d)

*This article explains the current status of biotechnology in agricultural field and urges the*
reader to think about the future of genetic engineering. (Yuka)

(8e)

This article describes that biotechnology and genetic engineering have brought a change in agricultural industry and human’s food. (High Group, #13)

In the above extracts (8c) through (8e), each of the students created a nominal phrase in order to rephrase the entire proposition in a compressed manner. Interestingly, similar to Keiko and Ryuichi who wrote the extracts (8a) and (8b), Eri and Yuka also commented in the interview that thinking about a global proposition in Japanese first was a necessary step to condense and generalize the source’s main point. The findings suggest that L1 usage might play a crucial role in packing a great deal of information into a noun phrase in L2. In other words, conceptual translation may be indispensable to constructing grammatical metaphors in another language.

In-depth qualitative analysis of the students’ summaries also revealed another important function of grammatical metaphor when used for the functions of generalization: a device for constructing the author’s argument or viewpoint. In the original text used for this study, the author concluded with the following questions: What do you think will be the future of genetic engineering for farming purposes? What other changes can you imagine will take place? Do you think that nature should decide such things, or do you think that people have the right to genetically change plants and animals? (see Appendix N). These questions were interpreted by the students as the author’s viewpoint on genetic engineering, which was then reconstructed by the use of grammatical metaphor. The following extracts
show how the students used grammatical metaphors to structure their interpretation of the author’s viewpoint.

(8f)

*The author raises some ethical issues of genetic engineering by asking the reader whether we have the right to change the nature.* (High Group #5)

(8g)

*The author shows his anxiety about the current situation of biotechnology and its future.* (High Group #8)

(8h)

*The author suggests the importance of thinking about the future of biotechnology from an ethical viewpoint.* (High Group #15)

In the above extracts, the students created a nominal phrase in order to compress the author’s viewpoint. It is interesting to note that the students successfully elicited the superordinate concepts, such as “ethical issues,” “his anxiety,” and “ethical viewpoint,” from the questions posed by the author. This indicates that advanced writers’ summarizing skills might be explained by their ability to reinterpret the content of the source text at a macro level and differentiate levels of importance in the information. Notably, it appears that the students’ ability to conceptualize the source content at different levels of importance paralleled their use of grammatical metaphors in their L2 summaries, which
apparently contributed to the construction of rhetorically effective summaries.

It is noteworthy that the above extracts (8a) through (8h) show that the students’ summaries contained mental and verbal processes (e.g., describe, explain, and suggest, etc.) that played a role in reporting the source information in an objective manner. In summary writing, the writer needs to apply the grammar of reported speech and citation to achieve the appropriate level of detachment and intersubjectivity (Martin & White, 2005). This is typically achieved through the use of reporting verbs along with additional projecting clauses (Taverniers, 2003). The occurrence of these reporting features, however, was not observed in either of the students’ summaries written at the beginning of the semester, only at the end (and only among writers from the high proficiency group). As revealed in the students’ reflective comments (e.g., Extracts [18] and [19]), the findings indicate that as they experienced the genre-based tasks, the students learned the genre conventions critical to effective summary and applied them to their summarizing tasks—including the conventions that require writers to detach themselves from the reported information.

8.2.3.4.2 Reasoning

An analysis of the students’ summaries showed that the metaphoric transformation of a clause into a nominal expression not only contributed to generalizing the source information, but also served as reasoning—the “point of departure” (Halliday, 1994, p. 37) for a further step in topic development. That is, the students’ summaries showed that grammatical metaphor in the thematic position contributed to the organization and development of the summary structure. This was achieved by condensing the previous information into a noun phrase and linking the information between two sentences. The
following extracts illustrate these phenomena.

(8i)
The article reports that genetic engineering is important for improving the quality of livestock. The use of genetic engineering enables us to produce higher quality meats and milk. (High Group #1)

(8j)
The author explains that plant genetics is valuable to produce new species of food plants by special operation. The effective use of plant genetics brings us more varieties of vegetables, fruits. (High Group #4)

(8k)
The technology can produce cows which have high quality meat. However, the use of genetic engineering for farming purpose accompanies an ethical problem. (High Group #5)

(8l)
The author worries about human’s thoughtless use of genetic engineering. This is because the abuse of the technology could cause some damages to the environment. (High Group #6)

As demonstrated in the above extracts, the students used grammatical metaphors as
coherence and cohesion devices that signal a flow of information. Precisely, the choice of grammatical metaphor in a theme position was accompanied by that of grammatical metaphor in a rheme position in each of the students’ summarized sentences. In this way, the causal relationship unfolds more incongruently in the summary than in the original text. The following extracts show how the original meaning expressed in a congruent way was changed by the students into a metaphorical form.

(8m)
The original sentence:
Plant diseases from viruses cause great losses to farm crops every year. New plants are developed which can resist these viruses, so that such losses prevented.

The summarized sentence:
*The plants which have tolerance to viruses have contributed to prevention of big losses of farm crops.* (Keiko)

(8n)
The original sentence:
Genetic engineering is also important for improving the quality of farm animals. For example, breeders are able to use hormones to get prize cows to produce hundreds of eggs.

The summarized sentence:
*As an example of genetic engineering, the author says that the use of hormones enables*
breeders to get many eggs from cows with superior ability. (Ryuichi)

(8o)

The original sentence:
Genetic engineering is also important for improving the quality of farm animals. ... Another important reasons is to improve the quality of the meat itself .... Cows may be bred which can produce far more milk than cows could in the past.

The summarized sentence:

*The use of genetic engineering technology may bring us higher quality meat and larger quantity of milk.* (High Group, #11)

In sum, overall, the qualitative analysis of the students’ summary samples demonstrated the contribution of ideational grammatical metaphor to the “Theme and Information structuring” (Halliday, 1998) in a summarized text. The data showed that an increasing use of grammatical metaphors, in terms of both occurrence and functions, enabled students to write more rhetorically effective summaries at the end of the semester than at the beginning of the semester, by means of generalization (i.e., by construing the tone of technicality and condensing the author’s points and the thesis) and reasoning (i.e., by structuring the text coherently).

The two major functions of grammatical metaphors (i.e., generalization and reasoning) identified through the qualitative analysis of the students’ summaries are in accord with Halliday’s (1998) account. As discussed in Chapter 3, Halliday proposed that
grammatical metaphors consist of two key motifs: “the potential for referring” and “the potential for expanding” (Halliday, 1998, p. 195). Halliday continues to explain that, in academic discourses, the semiotic power of referring plays a role in creating technical taxonomies, whereas the semiotic power of expanding contributes to creating chains of reasoning or construing a line of argument leading on from one step to the next (emphasis in the original). The findings of this study indicate that the semiotic powers of referring and expanding are integral to creating effective discourses necessary for summarization, and that this can be taught successfully to EFL writers, at least when they have reached high-enough proficiency levels.

8.3 Summary

This chapter reported how the students in two different proficiency levels learned to write summaries that required a more academic approach compared to earlier experience of email writing and how they might have done so differently in the two different proficiency levels sampled in the study. In addition, it focused on how the students responded to the demands of summary writing, how their initial conceptualizations of the genre were transformed, and how they developed new ways of using language to accommodate the needs of the academic genre and accomplish the outcome.

Findings obtained from analysis of the questionnaires, free-writing reflections, and interviews showed that at the beginning of the semester, both groups of students had a less-informed understanding of what constituted a good summary and had difficulties specifying rules or conventions that they believed were important for effective summarization. The results of the background questionnaire revealed that none of the
students had been explicitly taught how to write a summary in either FL or L1 classes prior to taking the course. This finding indicates that their implicit, uncertain view of the genre might have been due to the lack of explicit instruction and practices before entering the university. Most notably, none of the students were previously familiar with the Western notion of plagiarism or even with the corresponding Japanese version of *hyoosetsu*.

The students’ unfamiliarity with the concept of plagiarism and *hyoosetsu*, together with their less-informed conceptualization of what constituted a good summary, were apparent in their actual summarizing performances at the beginning of the semester. The analysis of their summaries revealed that the majority of the students, regardless of their proficiency levels, relied on direct copy, or what Howard (1995) called “patchwriting” to summarize the key points of the source information. Consequently, it was found that more than 50% of the clauses were duplicated or plagiarized in the summaries written by both groups of students.

The students’ concerns about summary writing, however, changed over time and grew into a better informed understanding of the genre. It was of particular interest that their concerns shifted from a content-oriented approach (e.g., extracting a gist) to a more language-oriented method (e.g., rewording to avoid plagiarism, using reporting verbs). Analysis of the students’ retrospective comments revealed that the classroom-model analysis might have given them new insight into summary writing. That is, as the students continually engaged in analyzing various summary models from the three metafunctional perspectives (ideational, interpersonal, and textual), they appeared to have developed *metalanguage* (Marshall, 2008; McDonald, 2008), which enabled them to distance themselves from the model text and discuss the text with considerable objectivity to explain
reasons for making particular lexicogrammatical choices and patterns. Interestingly, the students’ reflections also revealed that their increasing awareness of language choices was accompanied by their enhanced awareness of the audience. As observed in their email writing experiences reported in Chapter 7, the students realized that what is written (i.e., subject matter) and how it is summarized (i.e., summary writing conventions) were also affected by what the intended audience required.

The changes in the students’ awareness and understanding of the genre were also reflected in the way they summarized the source text at the end of the semester. Comparisons of the pre- and post-instructional summary writing tasks revealed that both the higher and lower proficiency groups made gains in certain elements of their summary writing performance (i.e., holistic scores, fluency, lexical density, ratio of paraphrased clauses) even after a relatively short period of instruction and practice. Syntactic complexity, however, did not exhibit such changes. Among the improved elements, the increased ratio of paraphrased clauses was particularly noteworthy. At the beginning of the semester, extensive copying was evident in the students’ summary writing; however, the occurrences of direct textual duplication decreased markedly for both groups of students at the end of the semester.

Comparisons of the summaries written by different proficiency groups, however, showed that the degree of improvement differed depending on the students’ language proficiency levels. The advanced students exhibited more substantial improvement than the lower proficiency students in terms of holistic scores, fluency, and attempted paraphrases. Of particular note is that language proficiency plays a crucial role in the quality of grammatical richness of the students’ summarization. When expressing the entire
proposition of the source text in a compressed manner, the higher proficiency group was more likely to use ideational grammatical metaphors, and their reliance on ideational grammatical metaphors enabled them to generalize the thesis of the source text and expand the overall flow of information. The lower proficiency group, on the other hand, reconstructed the source information with only minor lexical changes and few global syntactic alterations, instead of drawing on the meaning-making options that grammatical metaphors might have enabled. These findings indicate that improved genre knowledge (i.e., a better understanding of what makes a good summary) might enable students to expand their language choices to some extent in a way that allows them to accommodate the genre demands. Yet, their limited language proficiency might impede the expansion of meaning-making resources at a productive level. Explaining this phenomenon based on SFL theory, it can be argued that more incongruent and metaphorical grammatical resources became available to the higher proficiency group, whereas the lower proficiency students’ grammatical choices were limited to only congruent and prototypical resources. It is interesting to find that although both groups of students, regardless of proficiency levels, perceived that their awareness and understanding of the genre somehow changed, their actual lexicogrammatical choices differed. It is noteworthy that an increase in grammatical richness was only observed in the higher proficiency group and not in the lower one.
CHAPTER 9
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The goal of this study was to document the ontogenetic development and longitudinal transformations of Japanese EFL writers’ rhetorical awareness, writing performances and their lexicogrammatical choices as they progressed through a one-year genre-based English writing courses that incorporated emails and summarization as core genres. A total of 30 students divided into two different proficiency levels (15 in a higher proficiency group and 15 in a lower proficiency group) participated in the study. In order to gain in-depth insight into the students’ longitudinal changes, a triangulated inquiry was employed by gathering naturalistic data from intact classes and by using a variety of techniques: questionnaires, interviews, free writing, teacher-researcher field notes, and pre-instructional and post-instructional writing samples produced by the students at the two different periods of each semester. It was expected that this triangulation in the process of collecting and interpreting the data would contribute toward an enhanced description and increased credibility or validity. This chapter summarizes the major findings on the basis of answers from the research questions provided in Chapter 5. Pedagogical implications of the main findings are presented, followed by limitations and suggestions for future research.

9.1 Longitudinal changes of individual EFL writers

*Research Question One*: How does the rhetorical awareness and genre knowledge of undergraduate EFL writers, as reflected in interviews, questionnaires, classroom free writes, and so on, change over time as they engage in systematically
designed, genre-based tasks and materials?

Similar developmental processes were observed in the students’ learning of both emails and summarization in regard to genre-appropriate rhetorical awareness and knowledge. The background questionnaire revealed that the students’ prior experiences of writing the genres in the EFL context had been extremely limited. It was thus speculated that their genre schemata was insufficiently developed (including in their L1) at the start of each semester in the two-course sequence, which was apparent in the ways that the students defined or conceptualized each genre, especially how they specified the aspects that could make each genre more effective. At the initial stage of each semester, the students reported insecurities about how to write the genre and showed a less-informed, implicit understanding of what was expected from the task demands. As a result, it was found that their explicit concerns were more oriented toward less-genre specific, global issues that could be applicable to any type of written genre characterization, such as clarity, conciseness, and overall structure for both email and summary writing. It appeared that for each of the two genres explicitly taught, the students had relied upon a limited “rules of thumb” approach for general writing. Further, it was found that the students had shaped their own beliefs about each genre on the basis of their prior experiences in other learning contexts (e.g., L1 kokugo classes and FL reading classes), many of which appeared to have conflicted with the expectations of the genre that they were asked to write in this study.

By comparison to their initial knowledge of the targeted genres, the results of the self-assessment conducted at the final stage of each semester revealed that certain changes in genre-informed rhetorical awareness were perceived by each of the students, irrespective
of their English proficiency levels. Specifically, the students demonstrated a noticeable change in the ways they conceptualized the genre, first for email writing and later for summary writing. In each case successively, the aspects of their concerns shifted to more genre-specific lexicogrammatical issues that could accommodate the needs of the given rhetorical context. Interestingly, the students’ self-assessment included explicit comments relating to the reader of their texts, such as “I began to pay more attention to who the intended audience was and what information the readers really wanted to know.” These findings clarified two important factors that can be said to be associated with the changes in the students’ genre awareness: improved knowledge of genre-specific language choices and enhanced audience awareness. More precisely, the students appeared to have developed keener awareness of the external context involving the intended audience of a text and gained a better understanding of how language was used accordingly. In addition, they also realized what lexicogrammatical resources were maximally appropriate to choose in order to create a certain meaning within the given rhetorical context.

A crucial issue that arises from the findings obtained for Research Question 1 is how and to what extent the improved rhetorical awareness and genre knowledge that the students gained through their email writing experiences in the first semester might have been applied and transferred to their summary writing experiences in the second semester. Although the study was not designed to address this question of transfer of knowledge from semester one to semester two, the following reflections can be offered to guide future research on this issue. The students’ rhetorical awareness data showed that although summary writing imposed new rhetorical demands and different kind of task demands on the students, general domains of the genre knowledge developed and were available as they
began to work with their first summary writing assignment. For example, the students’ reflections showed that several guiding questions used for email sample analysis helped them to organize their ideas for summary writing at the planning stage. The guiding questions included: In this writing task, who am I as writer? Is my role “student,” or do I have another role? Who is the audience of this text? How will I appeal to that audience? What content will be valued in this text? What subject will be important? In other words, these questions served as “mental grippers for organizing general domains of knowledge that can be applied to local situations” (Carter, 2007, p. 151). These “grippers” that emerged in the students’ minds in their new writing situation seemed to be a strong indicator of their increasingly raising rhetorical awareness, achieved through their email writing experiences across various rhetorical contexts represented and chained in the materials and tasks. However, these mental grippers alone did not help the students to actually produce the new genre, because of their only implicit understanding of how language features perform rhetorical actions in the given context in ways that can fulfill each of the rhetorical concerns posed by the guiding questions noted above. The findings suggest that not only “genre awareness” (i.e., their conscious attention to the larger social purposes or activity types of the targeted genre) but also “rhetorical awareness” (i.e., their explicit understanding of lexicogrammatical resources to realize the genre in a particular situation) is necessary to help inexperienced EFL writers to learn to appreciate the intricate and complex relationship between text (ideational, textual, and interpersonal resources) and context (field, mode, and tenor) and learn to recognize how language not only makes meaning that shapes a genre but also enables rhetorical relationships.
It is also important to note that the enhanced genre and rhetorical awareness affected two other important factors that possibly influenced the quality of their writing: cognitive problem solving during writing, and crosslinguistic transfer of genre knowledge. First, as the students developed keener awareness of the given rhetorical context, their cognitive problem-solving behaviors associated with process writing improved. That is, the students began to increase their planning, especially in regard to responding to the task requirements and fulfilling the audience’s needs before writing. This finding indicates the possibility that if writers are able to pay more conscious attention to the needs of the genre, then the quality of their planning or goal-setting might be improved. In addition, their attention patterns while writing might be more systematically organized and oriented toward genre-appropriate goals. Such positive changes in the process of writing are important in enabling more mature writing behaviors and also more successful writing in the long run (Flower & Hays, 1981). In addition to benefiting their cognitive problem-solving behaviors, the second factor stemming from enhanced genre and rhetorical awareness is associated with cross-linguistic transfer of genre knowledge. On the basis of the students’ reflective comments, the genre knowledge that they gained in their FL enriched the ways in which they perceived the same genre in their L1. That is, the genre knowledge gained in their FL helped them to write the same genre in their L1 and enabled them to choose more appropriate L1 expressions to achieve the overall goal.

*Research Question Two:* How does the overall writing performance of undergraduate EFL writers change over time as they engage in systematically designed, genre-based tasks and materials, as measured on their pre- and post-instruction writing
performance in terms of holistic scores of their writing by human raters, the fluency of their written production, and the syntactic complexity of their texts?

The above research question aimed to investigate the students’ ability to put the genre awareness and rhetorical awareness to productive use. To this end, the students’ pre- and post-instructional genre writing performances were compared and analyzed in terms of the following three variables: holistic scores, fluency (measured by total number of words, total number of T-units, and total number of clauses), and complexity (measured by MLTU, MLC, and CTU).

In terms of holistic scores, both groups exhibited gains on both the email and the summary writing tasks. This indicates that both groups of students learned to produce the genre more appropriately in terms of the criteria included in the genre-specific rubrics used by the two raters (cf. Appendices A and B): task appropriacy (tone, register, audience awareness), cohesion and organization, and grammatical control. The two groups of students also showed improvement in fluency. In response to the task prompt, the students learned to write more at the end of the semester than at the beginning, with a larger number of words, T-units, and clauses in their email and summary writing tasks, respectively.

Whereas holistic score and writing fluency exhibited notable changes at the end of the semester, complexity did not show any change in either the email and summary writing tasks. It can thus be assumed that certain variables that measured writing competence required more time to show improvement than others. Precisely, 15 weeks might be enough time to develop the students’ holistic scores and writing fluency, yet the same amount of
time might not be sufficient for students to develop the ability to produce more syntactically complex texts.

**Research Question Three**: For undergraduate EFL writers, how do the lexicogrammatical choices of making meaning in a given rhetorical situation change over time as they engage in systematically designed, genre-based tasks and materials, as indexed by lexical density and interpersonal grammatical metaphor use on pre- and post-instruction email writing and by lexical density, attempted paraphrase, and use of ideational grammatical metaphor on pre- and post-instruction summary writing?

In addition to the overall change in the students’ writing performance reported in Research Question Two, and in order to provide a fuller picture of the students’ ability to put the awareness/knowledge of the genre to productive use, it was also important to investigate whether and how their lexicogrammatical choices within a specific rhetorical situation changed from the beginning to the end of the course. To this end, students’ lexicogrammatical choices on the pre- and post-instructional writing tasks were compared and analyzed in terms of the degree of lexical/grammatical richness, measured for email writing in terms of lexical density, interpersonal grammatical metaphors, and requestive moves and for summary writing via lexical density, the amount of the attempted paraphrase, and ideational grammatical metaphors. The major findings of the email writing tasks are discussed first, followed by those of the summary writing tasks.

In terms of lexical density in the email writing tasks, the students’ textual products
demonstrated few changes over time. Two speculations can be made concerning this static state of lexical density. First, although the students were able to write emails more fluently by using a larger number of words, T-units, and clauses, their improvement in fluency might not necessarily reflect that the their emails actually provided more dense information, given that the lexical density value is associated with a high proportion of content words (i.e., a high lexical density) that contain more information than just function words (i.e., prepositions, interjections, pronouns, conjunctions and count words). A second point however offers caution against this first speculation. Namely, lexical density depends on the syntactic and cohesive properties of a composition, and hence fewer lexical words may reflect more subordinate clauses, participial phrases, and ellipsis, all of which are not lexical but structural characteristics of a composition (Laufer & Nation, 1995). The interpersonal grammatical metaphors used in emails are mostly of the subordination kind, which generally result in more clausal and dynamic in style, with more grammatical intricacy (Norris & Ortega, 2009). Therefore, the static state of lexical density, in this case, might indicate the possibility that the students began to use more grammatically intricate texts with more elaborate clause-combining strategies (Colombi, 2002).

As for grammatical richness in the email writing tasks, it was found that the requestive strategies employed by the students in their pre-instructional tasks were characterized by their heavy reliance on prototypical and congruent expressions, such as imperatives (e.g., please...) and want-based strategies (e.g., I want you to...). In other words, interpersonal grammatical metaphors by means of incongruent request forms, such as if-clauses (e.g., I wondered if...), were almost absent for these students at the beginning of the semester. However, their requestive strategies employed in their post-instructional
writing tasks demonstrated a shift to more metaphorical and more incongruent request forms, especially in the higher proficiency group. It is also important to note that the changes in their requestive strategies were accompanied by those in structural moves utilized by the students to articulate the communicative purpose of the request. Their emails written for the pre-instructional tasks were characterized by the minimal use of supportive moves. However, in their post-instructional email tasks, a greater variety of supportive moves were available, which allowed them to externally modify requests, such as giving reasons and explanations, summarizing, and ending politely.

In the summary writing tasks, one of the notable features identified in the initial stage of the semester was that the students’ summaries consisted primarily of a direct duplication of the original sentences. Their inappropriate summarizing strategies might have reflected a lack of prior experience or formal instruction in summary writing. However, their post-instructional summarizing tasks demonstrated a dramatic increase in the proportion of the paraphrased clauses, which suggests that the students had learned the conventions and rules of the genre and attempted to apply what they had learned to the given tasks. Their post-instructional summarizing performances also exhibited gains in lexical density, which indicates that the students’ summaries produced at the end of the course contained more dense information with more lexical items or content words per clause than those produced at the initial stage. This rise in lexical density could be attributed to the increasingly rate at which the students relied on ideational grammatical metaphors in order to compress the original author’s ideas into a nominal phrase.
9.2 Comparisons of longitudinal changes in two proficiency levels

Research Question Four: How does the developmental process of gaining rhetorical awareness and genre knowledge through genre instruction (i.e., as investigated in RQ1) differ between the two different proficiency levels?

In both the email and summary writing tasks, there were few differences between the two groups in terms of what degree they had changed the ways they perceived each genre. That is, both groups of students perceived that they had learned new things about the genre from the instruction, and certain changes were perceived by each of the students in the ways they conceptualized each genre, regardless of their English proficiency levels. However, it was found that the students in the higher proficiency group perceived more improvement than did those in the lower proficiency group. This indicates that the students in the lower proficiency group generally underestimated their improvement as FL writers, even though they perceived that some learning had taken place.

It was also found that the group differences in students’ self-assessment might be associated with the degree of confidence they felt. The students in the higher proficiency group not only felt improvement but also reported gained confidence in writing the genre, which appeared to have come from two important factors. First, the higher-proficiency students felt an increased expansion of meaning-making resources and attributed it to the instruction they received, particularly to the benefits of analyzing multiple genre models in class. The students in the higher proficiency group perceived that exposure to and analysis of different genre models enabled them to convert receptive knowledge into productive knowledge, which allowed them to make form-meaning-function connections and to
harness them in the creation of their own texts. The other factor in regard to gaining confidence was the students’ enhanced audience awareness, especially the benefits of tasks and activities that focused on the conveyance of meaning in the act of written communication, such as emails, but also for more academic and less interactive genres, such as summaries.

These results suggest that the students in the higher proficiency group are more likely to become confident in using lexicogrammaritacal resources in a more context-sensitive manner and within a relatively short span of time. In other words, there is a proficiency effect on the developmental process of genre awareness and knowledge at the perception level. The advanced students might have had sufficient linguistic ability to notice how genre conventions or socio-pragmatic rules were pragmalinguistically implemented, and this may have boosted their confidence in ways that were not available for the lower-proficiency students.

**Research Question Five:** Do any patterns uncovered for pre/post-instruction changes in overall writing performance (i.e., as investigated in RQ2) differ between the two different proficiency levels?

In terms of holistic scores, although both groups improved their overall quality on each genre over the 15-week course, the students in the higher proficiency group exhibited greater gains and well above the magnitude of the gains experienced by the lower proficiency group. Thus, it is worth emphasizing that although the two groups of students started off at a similar level in their pre-instructional task in terms of holistic scores, their
language proficiency ultimately affected their writing performances in their post-instructional tasks for both emails and summaries.

The same tendency was observed in the development of the two groups’ fluency. Although writing fluency generally improved over the semester for both the higher and lower proficiency groups, the higher-proficiency students improved their fluency much more than the lower-proficiency students. As for syntactic complexity, however, there were no meaningful group differences in either the email or the summary writing tasks.

In summary, it can be argued that the students at a higher proficiency level became more competent at completing the genre, and responded to the task expectations in a more context-sensitive manner, while creating coherent, well-organized texts of substantial length with more contextually appropriate grammar.

*Research Question Six:* Do any patterns uncovered for pre/post-instruction changes in lexicogrammatical choices (i.e., as investigated in RQ3) differ between the two different proficiency levels?

Among the variables investigated, grammatical richness exhibited the most pronounced group differences, and these are particularly worthy of attention. Grammatically metaphorized meaning-making choices were almost absent for both groups of students at the initial stage of each semester. In the email writing tasks, the students’ choices were more oriented toward prototypical, congruent, and direct request forms, such as imperatives and want-based strategies, irrespective of their proficiency levels. In the summary writing tasks, the students’ choices were characterized by direct duplications of
the original sentences with no grammatical elaboration, regardless of their proficiency levels. At the last stage of each of the two instructional periods, however, the language choices of the advanced students shifted toward more incongruent expressions to create a certain meaning in the same rhetorical context. In the email writing tasks, the students in the advanced group became more competent at adjusting requestive strategies to accommodate the needs of the given context and choosing more genre-appropriate language forms from the various options, which resulted in their reliance on interpersonal grammatical metaphors and on varying types of supportive moves. In the summary writing tasks, the advanced group of students also demonstrated a shift toward metaphorized meaning-making choices in order to reword the source information. Ideational grammatical metaphors by means of nominalization predominated in their meaning-making choices in their post-instructional summary writing tasks. The students in the lower proficiency group, on the other hand, did not show such change in their lexicogrammatical choices and continued to rely on prototypical forms at the end of the course. In the email writing tasks, the lower proficiency group usually relied on want-based strategies in order to achieve the outcome, and this preference did not change throughout the entire research period. In the summary writing task tasks, while the students in the higher proficiency group generally relied on global modifications, such as creating ideational grammatical metaphors through nominalization, those in the lower proficiency group generally used minimal modifications, such as using synonyms. The results suggested that the higher proficiency students began to choose grammatically metaphorical expressions more frequently than their lower proficiency counterparts at the end of each semester, while the preference of the lower-proficiency students for congruent request forms did not show any changes over time.
9.3 Limitations and suggestions for further research

In spite of such suggestive findings, however, the present study has many limitations and should be complemented by further studies. First, the present study was framed as a longitudinal case study in order to carefully document how language development was facilitated by the students’ understanding of and interaction with genres that occurred in various rhetorical contexts. Due to the nature of the case study method, however, the findings of this study cannot be extrapolated to a wider range of educational contexts and a larger population.

Moreover, since the present study focused on the students’ changes within one academic year of the genre-based EFL writing instruction, it remains unclear whether the students maintained genre knowledge, writing strategies, and lexicogrammatical resources that they had learned and transferred them to their subsequent practices in real-life writing situations, something that is of utmost importance to establish in educational contexts, and particularly in instructional innovation inspired by TBLT (Long & Crookes, 1993; Long & Norris, 2000; Norris, 2009; Skehan, 1996). Unfortunately, delayed post-tests could not be administered due to the institutional constraints. That is, because the students were enrolled in the final course of the compulsory English curriculum when this study was conducted, it was difficult for the researcher to contact all the students after they completed the course. Hence, it would be informative if further study could focus on college-level FL writers for a period longer than one academic year and explore if or how they transfer genre knowledge learned through instruction into practice. The research on the influences of instruction on
students’ subsequent writing practices would definitely increase the validity of the interpreted results.

Another related issue to be addressed includes how much development could be observed on a long-term basis for the students’ writing practices in other domains. The two-semester sequence of genre-based writing courses in this study was limited to developing knowledge of certain genres, given that the course focused on emails and summaries as core genres, although interspersed with a variety of other tasks and materials reflecting a wide range of genre chains (see Chapter 6, and Tables 6.3 and 6.12). The data therefore provided evidence regarding how proficient the students had become with the core genres over one academic year, but it did not do so for whether or how they applied what they had learned in their classroom to subsequent encounters with new genres. Devitt (2004) argues that the genres students experience in a classroom develop into a part of their genre repertoires and then “become available to them as antecedents for learning new genres, and inculcate in them particular perceptions of situations” (p. 203). The present findings should therefore be expanded by further research that investigated whether or how previously learned genres serve as antecedents for further learning and practice with different genres.

Lastly, the present study did not prioritize how the students used language in a grammatically correct fashion, as none of the textual measures considered accuracy. Rather, it placed a primary focus on how the students used language to make meaning by measuring fluency and language choices. SFL approaches generally do not focus on the infelicities characteristics of students’ language use; instead, the focus of SFL is to identify the strengths writers bring to the writing task and additional lexicogrammatical resources
that they could develop to write more effectively (Celce-Murcia, 2002; Mohan & Beckett, 2001; Schleppegrell, 1998, 2006). Following the SFL approaches, the present study sought to examine how the students’ meaning-making resources changed and expanded over time, not whether their choices had no grammatical errors. However, from the perspective of second language acquisition, if students are to achieve advanced literacy skills, they must acquire the correct forms of the target language. Future studies should thus focus on the issue of accuracy and its relationship to genre learning, which will improve our understanding of how language development and writing development reciprocally influence each other (Manchón, 2011).

9.4 Implications of main findings

9.4.1 Theoretical implications

9.4.1.1 Genre acquisition and FL development

As reviewed in Chapter 2, the acquisition of genre in the FL classroom within East-Asian EFL educational contexts has not been systematically investigated to date. A particularly neglected area of research on genre learning has been their ontogenetic development as language learners. That is, although much L2 research on genre learning has focused on how students learn to write in a second language, minimal attention has been paid to how they learn a second language through writing. For this reason, the present study conducted a careful analysis of longitudinal student data across proficiency levels in an attempt to improve our understanding of the ultimately most interesting theoretical issue which the study was designed to speak to, namely the relationship between genre acquisition and language development in FL writers. In particular, this study examined how
students in different proficiency levels used carefully designed genre-based tasks on each of the two genres consecutively over two semesters and improved their genre awareness, genre production, and lexicogrammatical choices.

Several theoretical implications can be drawn from the findings of this study. First, the finding that the frequency of more refined, metaphorized, and incongruent ways of making meaning increased markedly in the advanced students, suggests that genre knowledge facilitates the development of lexicogrammatical competence for the target language in FL educational contexts. At the early stage of the course, the students had only a limited competence in situational variations when they attempted to realize a genre, even though they had already finished a six-year, compulsory English education under the national curriculum. The background questionnaire revealed that the students had minimal previous experience of writing the genre, and thus lacked local or context-specific knowledge. Consequently, they appeared to have drawn upon general knowledge or a limited “rules of thumb” approach that had been shaped through their previous learning experiences. For example, when asked to write a request email, the students predominantly chose direct, prototypical, and congruent forms, such as want-based strategies (e.g., I want you to) and imperatives (e.g., please...). That is, the genre was realized in ways that conformed to the level of their existing lexicogrammatical knowledge. However, many of the variations that emerged at a later period (e.g., I wonder if, I’d appreciate it if) appeared to have already been in place at a receptive level in the students’ existing lexicogrammatical schemata from the beginning. The students perceived that they had already known the meaning of the formulaic expressions but had not known how to effectively use them in a particular context. However, as the students engaged in the
systematically designed, genre-based tasks, it appeared that they became sensitized to the intricate relationship between form, meaning, and function of the lexicogrammatical resources, and the receptive level of lexicogrammatical knowledge that had been present in their schemata was transformed to the productive level. The results imply that lexicogrammatical rather than genre knowledge predominates in the early stage of language development, at least in the undergraduate FL students who learned English in Japanese educational contexts. In the FL educational context, wherein students rely heavily on explicit instruction, the lexicogrammatical competence may not be able to fully develop without the increased exposure of genres and enhanced genre awareness. In other words, lexicogrammatical knowledge develops in ways that adjust to the developing genre knowledge within the FL contexts. Genre knowledge can in turn be shaped by the development of the lexicogrammatical knowledge. It is through the reciprocal or circular causality that students ultimately learn to write in a second language.

Second, the finding that proficiency differences were markedly observed in the students’ reliance on grammatical metaphors, rather than in their syntactic performances, implies that the developmental process of FL students’ writing skills might be characterized by emerging lexicogrammatical elaborations, rather than syntactic complexities. As reviewed in Chapter 3, the progression from congruent to incongruent ways of meaning-making is the most important concept that describes language development in SFL theory. Importantly, SFL theory shows that the congruent-to-incongruent progression is characterized by students’ reliance on grammatical metaphor. This trajectory for the development of sensitivity to metaphorized expressions was also observed in the advanced groups of students in this study. For example, instead of writing “Please create a
“non-smoking area” (a congruent, prototypical, and unmarked realization), which was the predominant meaning-making choice in their request strategies observed at an early stage of development, the students began to choose the expression “I wonder if you could create a non-smoking area” (an incongruent, technical, and marked realization) as they progressed through the genre-based course. The same type of trajectory was observed in ways the advanced students summarized the source information. Although their summaries produced at the beginning of the course contained a number of exact copies of the original sentences, conscious attempts were made by the students at the end of the course to paraphrase the original information. Importantly, their paraphrases were mostly realized by packing substantial information into a noun phrase, which resulted in their increasing reliance on ideational grammatical metaphors. The finding that this type of trajectory was observed only in the advanced students implies that the ability to use more metaphorical language forms may appear at a later stage of the language learning process. The development of grammatical metaphor can thus be described, as termed by Ortega and Byrnes (2008), as “late-emerging capacities” (p. 6) and can therefore serves as a sign of advancedness in language learners.

Lastly, the relationship among genre, choices, and constraints may be noteworthy at this point. As reviewed in Chapter 2, there has been a criticism against genre-based pedagogies due to the potential danger of accommodating students to the model of the dominant discourse (Benesch, 1993; Pennycook 1997), the impossibility of knowing ever-shifting textual features and their underlying ideologies (Freedman, 1993a) and the vital role of situated practices and disciplinary participation in learning genres (Spack, 1988, 1997; Freedman, Adam, & Smart, 1994). The question that has been a main concern for
researchers is whether genres can be explicitly taught to students in the writing classroom. However, the findings of this study indicate that this question might be somewhat irrelevant, at least in the FL educational contexts, since the primary goal is to help students to understand how the target language is typically used to achieve a communicative purpose or as Ken Hyland stated, “socially recognized ways of using language” (Johns et al., 2006, p. 237). In this study, genres played an integral role in helping the students to learn how to use the FL and how to write in the FL to achieve an outcome. Importantly, the students did not simply insert their ideas into restrictive formulas or static molds but they developed abilities to analyze contexts (i.e., rhetorical reading skills) and acknowledge choices and variations at ideational, interpersonal, and textual levels (i.e., expansion of meaning-making choices). Concretely, two positive effects were observed as a consequence of the genre-based tasks. First, their increasingly sophisticated rhetorical reading skills, along with the enhanced genre awareness, led to deepened lexicogrammatical knowledge, which in turn enabled the advanced students to transform their lexicogrammatical knowledge from receptive to a more productive use. Second, their enhanced awareness of meaning-making choices and variations facilitated not only how they wrote but also what they wrote, as seen in their increasingly reliance on supportive moves in their requestive acts. The implication that can be drawn from these findings is that the awareness of constraints could be interpreted as an awareness of choices. That is, as Hyland (2004) argued, choice can be facilitated by constraint, and “the ability to create meaning is made possible by awareness of the choices and constraints that the genre offers” (Hyland, 2004, p. 20). This insight may be crucial as it applies to teaching novice writers who have little or no experience of writing different genres in a foreign, or even a first language. In all, within FL contexts, instead of
asking whether or not genres can be taught explicitly to students, the following question might be more relevant: How can genres contribute to language learning and writing development?

9.4.1.2 Biliterate perspective on genre learning

Although beyond the scope of this study, the findings tentatively offer some insight into how the two languages possessed by FL writers contribute to the shaping of their genre knowledge. It was found that students’ L1 use as well as their familiarity with a similar genre in the L1 context might play a key role in helping FL writers who simultaneously learn how to use the language and how to write in the language. This finding indicates the possibility that genre knowledge or experience gained in one language context may be transferrable to another language context. Theoretically, the validity of cross-linguistic transfer has been accounted for by Jim Cummins’s “interdependence hypothesis” (Cummins, 1979, 1980, 1989, 1991). This theory assumes that what appears to be two very different phenomena on or above the surface is actually interdependent conceptually, thereby indicating that L2 writers rely on the underlying cognitive proficiency which is common across languages. As a result, this common underlying proficiency facilitates the transfer of skills from L1 to L2. The empirical evidence accumulated to date has confirmed that some aspects of L1 composing competence can be transferred to L2 writing: problem-solving/decision-making strategies in writing process (Cumming, 1989; Cumming et al., 1989; Hall, 1990; Jones & Tetroe, 1987; Manchon et al., in press; Pennington & So, 1993; Roca de Larios et al., 2006, 2008; Uzawa, 1996; Whalen & Menard, 1995; Zamel, 1983), organizational patterns (Hirose, 2003; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008; Kubota, 1998;
Uysal, 2008), and syntactic structure (Kecskes, 1998). The findings of this study tentatively suggest that genre knowledge can be another important dimension that can be transferable across languages.

The findings of this study offer another significant dimension. The students in this study described that they transferred their genre knowledge or genre experience from L1 to FL as well as from FL to L1. This finding sheds light on the interactive nature of cross-linguistic transfer of genre knowledge. Specifically, the students’ reflective comments pointed to the possibility that when FL writers shaped their understanding of how to write the genre in FL for diverse functional goals, they consciously pay more conscious attention to their choice of L1 expressions when writing for the same or similar functional goals. This finding suggests that genre instruction might facilitate FL writers’ biliteracy development, as argued by Kobayashi & Rinnert (2008) and Uysal (2008), by offering them a metalinguistic tool to further explore another language to make the same or similar meaning. It can thus be argued that writing instruction in one language leads not only to literacy skills in the same language, but also to deeper conceptual and linguistic proficiency related to literacy in another language.

9.4.2 Implications for pedagogical practice

9.4.2.1 Genre-based writing pedagogy from the SFL perspective

Triangulated inquiry of multiple data, including questionnaires, interviews, and free-writing reflections, revealed that explicit textual analysis and discussions about genre models were helpful for these inexperienced FL students, in particular, when noticing lexicogrammatical features of the genre as well as conventional styles and organization.
required to respond to task requirements and audience expectations. The most beneficial aspect of the genre analysis was, according to the students’ reflective comments, a set of facilitative questions that led them to analyze how language was used to create a certain meaning in a text, such as *What is the purpose of the email? Who are involved in the interactive textual communication?* and *What transitional signals are used to connect paragraphs?* The FL students unanimously addressed that by analyzing models and samples on the basis of these guiding questions, they developed an understanding of how the lexical and grammatical items that they had learned receptively were actually used in real-life situations to convey meaning to the reader. The results suggest that, as Tardy (2009) observed in her study, “textual interaction tasks” serve as powerful tools for inexperienced FL writers when building a framework for working in the challenging environment of a foreign domain. More precisely, encouraging students to interact with texts at the three metafunction levels that are informed by SFL theory: (1) ideational (the propositional content of text and the relationship between ideas), (2) interpersonal (interpersonal relationship between the writer and the reader), and (3) textual (discourse to organize a text, strings of words, or isolated sentences and clauses). In addition, these levels might enhance the students’ *rhetorical reading* skills, which enable them to pay more conscious “attention to the role of various rhetorical parameters, such as writer, reader, and purpose, in shaping a particular genre” (Cheng, 2008a, p. 53). Their increasingly sophisticated rhetorical reading of genre models and samples, along with the facilitative questions at the three metafunctional levels, might have become part of the students’ experience and knowledge base, while helping them to enhance their specification of the rhetorical context and activate the form-meaning-function mapping. Furthermore, and more
importantly, these rhetorical reading skills might have helped the students to respond to the requirements of a new genre that was unfamiliar to them, as seen in the transition between emails and summarization.

It should be emphasized here that regarding the genre models and samples used for textual interaction tasks, teachers need to avoid using a single model as a static template. In the present study, I designed the genre-based tasks and materials such that they provided a “genre-rich environment in which students have access to a range of strategies and resources” (Tardy, 2009, p. 283). In this environment, the students were exposed to two or three instances of any given genre, and by doing so, they were given the opportunity to see how a single genre may be approached by different writers in varying rhetorical contexts. The models were collected from published sources, but sometimes they contained the students’ own writing selections from their previous assignments. By providing the opportunities to compare these various genre instances, the students were expected to notice that variations exist in the realization of a single genre and that writers are even allowed to individualize the genre for unique rhetorical purposes. As discussed in the previous section as well as Chapter 2, some composition scholars express concerns about teaching genre as a static form. However, with teachers’ deliberate efforts to build such a genre-rich environment, the writing classroom can foster genre learning without imposing on students the de-contextualized, template-like static forms.

Concerning the genre-rich environment, it should also be emphasized that the genre-base tasks and materials in this study provided the students with opportunities to learn “systems of genres” (Bazerman, 1994) or “genre networks” (Hyland, 2007) by interspersing some other related genres into the syllabus (e.g., tourist information and hotel
advertisement. See Chapter 6). Exposing the students to intertextual systems or networks of genres served as a valuable opportunity for them to be aware of “the rhetorical processes through which genres are created, distributed, and responded to” (Tardy, 2009, p. 286). The intertextual links between genres are crucial elements to be addressed in genre learning in FL educational contexts. This is because FL students need to be aware of not only individual genres but also how they relate to one another (Martin & Rose, 2008). Furthermore, genre networks provide FL students with the opportunity to not only learn about genres on their own but also learn how language is used to realize a genre and how writing is conducted through genres in real-life contexts.

Textual interaction tasks in such a genre-rich environment might be most beneficial to undergraduate FL writers, especially those who have completed six years of English education in junior and senior high schools, and developed substantial lexicogrammatical knowledge and experience at least at a receptive level. As indicated by the students’ comments in the interviews, because they had learned English as a foreign language for at least six years, they knew some words and phrases in English that could be used for the genre, but they were uncertain as to how to effectively use them to realize the genre. In other words, the students had “general knowledge” about English, but their “local knowledge” that could be used within a specific domain had not been fully developed at the very beginning of the course. However, as the students were encouraged to analyze and discuss the form-meaning-function relationship in specific instances of L2 use through the situated textual interaction tasks, they might have become sensitized to a variety of lexicogrammatical resources, genre functions and its realization patterns, and which lexicogrammatical items were appropriate to make meaning in a given rhetorical context. In
general, FL writers are often less exposed to the intricate relationship between language and genre in real-life situations than is typically the case for SL writers. Therefore, incidental learning of the genre-language relationship is less likely to occur in FL contexts. Thus, where the acquisition of genres in FL contexts is concerned, the awareness of appropriate expressions is crucial. To make this happen, the linguistic resources for making meaning in a text, including lexis, grammar, and discourse structure, have to be brought to consciousness and taught explicitly to students (Martin, 2009). The results of this study suggest that a deliberate effort to teach and expand these resources explicitly, particularly through the situated textual interaction tasks, is meaningful in FL instructional contexts in terms of L2 acquisition and writing development.

It should be noted, however, that proficiency differences were observed at a productive level in the end of each course, namely, in terms of to what degree they were able to apply their increasingly enhanced rhetorical reading skills to their genre production. In the beginning phase of the course, the students’ proficiency differences did not create tremendous differences, as seen in their writing performances on the pre-instructional tasks. However, their different language proficiency levels eventually influenced their performances in the post-instructional writing tasks, although both groups of students showed increasingly enhanced genre awareness and began to read the texts in a more context-sensitive manner. Group differences were especially noticeable in the lexicogrammatical sophistication of their written texts. While the students in the higher proficiency group were eventually able to retrieve more metaphorized and sophisticated genre-specific lexicogrammatical resources to make meaning within the given rhetorical context, those in the lower proficiency group had difficulties retrieving such metaphorical
expressions from memory and continued to rely on more prototypical, congruent forms to make meaning. The overall results offer the following pedagogical implication regarding the relationship between language proficiency and genre learning. Undergraduate FL writers can transform their lexicogrammatical knowledge from receptive to productive use, or from general to local use, even after a short period of instruction, if situated textual interaction tasks are systematically designed such that writers can gradually develop a range of lexicogrammatical choices to make when performing a certain social action in a socially appropriate manner. However, there might be a certain threshold level of language proficiency that FL writers must achieve in order for them to transfer their receptive lexicogrammatical knowledge to productive use. The threshold level of language proficiency here means the ability to (a) know when and how a particular linguistic resources should be used and why, (b) to adapt their knowledge to different contexts, and (c) to choose maximally appropriate linguistic resources to create a certain meaning. The development of the ability to make such strategic choices might be pushed by advanced language proficiency.

In previous studies on second and foreign language acquisition, the abovementioned issues have been discussed mostly within the framework of interlanguage pragmatics in terms of the relationship between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competences with emphasis on students’ oral communication skills or “speech act” (e.g., Felix-Brasdefer, 2007; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Koike, 1989; Matsumura, 2007; Schmidt, 1983; Trosberg, 1995). However, while studies on interlanguage pragmatics have revealed how pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic problem areas are tackled by L2 students, minimal interest has been taken in the problems L2 writers are confronted with when they try to
master communicative functions through writing. In the context of writing, from the SFL perspective, sociopragmatic competence corresponds to genre knowledge that enables writers to realize certain social actions in a contextually appropriate way, while pragmalinguistic competence corresponds to lexicogrammatical resources possessed by students for conveying the social action to audiences through writing. Thus, the question of how L2 writers learn to write genres while expanding their lexicogrammatical resources to create meaning is a fruitful area for studies on L2 acquisition as well as interlanguage pragmatic development. This is especially the case, given that writing provides students with sufficient time to reflect on, revise, and edit their original meaning-making choices, unlike the act of speaking that requires automatic, spontaneous, and unreflective performance and fluency. However, surprisingly, few studies have focused on this area in the context of writing, and minimal attention has been paid to the problems FL writers encounter in the process of expanding their meaning-making resources and learning to realize a genre. It is thus hoped that the findings of this study will have some impact on the development of teaching materials to help FL writers who learn both language and writing simultaneously in a foreign domain. More theoretically, SFL genre theory and interlanguage pragmatics could fruitfully crosspollinate each other to explore students’ overall L2 development, since both theories commonly view the development as the ability to create meaning valued and associated with a particular social action, such as in a specific sociorhetorical context and not a context-free type of language competence.
9.4.2.2 Linking task to genre

Another significant pedagogical implication that can be drawn from this study is concerned with the interface between task-based language teaching and genre-based writing pedagogy. The genre-based syllabus in this study, which borrowed ideas from task-based language teaching, indicates that FL writing pedagogy might be greatly informed by the link between the notions of task and genre. The primary goal of task-based classroom is to make classroom interaction closely resemble, as much as possible, natural communication in real-life situations. The task-based framework thus assumes that language should be used as a means to an end, and that the objective of such activities should be the successful completion of a task (outcome-based), rather than the formation of accurate utterances (form-based). Despite its focus on outcome, however, task-based language teaching seeks a compromise between communicative practice and formal instruction, thereby recognizing that every step toward the successful completion of a task need not take the form of communication practice. Precisely, the task-based theory provides an instructional framework that organizes language classrooms in a sequential manner: task input, pedagogic task, target task, and task follow-up (Norris, 2009). This framework involves systematically bringing a communicative environment into the classroom to encourage students to use a target language in a range of rhetorical situations beyond the classroom. In other words, at the task-input and pedagogic task phases, instruction encourages students to reflect on the formal features of the language, while the target-task phase encourages meaning-making processing, which is reinforced by the task-follow-up phase wherein students are encouraged to reflect on their own performances or meaning-making choices in terms of strengths and weaknesses. By doing so, task-based language teaching aims to
reconcile the need for a concern with explicit teaching of lexicogrammatical forms on the one hand, and communicative effectiveness on the other. These two types of instruction involve different potentials for language acquisition and are particularly meaningful to FL classrooms, in which incidental learning is rare in students’ real-life situations. Therefore, students require both explicit instruction of the forms and practices for the meaning conveyance.

In this way, task-based approaches provide a systematic framework for sequencing tasks, while facilitating student progress toward the goal of using their lexicogrammatical resources in meaningful and appropriate ways to accomplish some “authentic” communicative tasks similar to those that students might encounter in real-life or instructional contexts. On the basis of its primary focus on “authenticity,” task-based approaches place importance on tasks designed for interactive communication or reciprocal tasks that are intended to engage students to focus primarily on the conveyance of meaning in the act of communication. Meanwhile, the notion of genre presents a different set of rhetorical choices or possibilities (Cheng, 2008a; Hyland, 2004) based on its functional goal: from lexicon and grammar to format, content, and organization. As long as writing is a situated activity, it does not stand alone as the discrete act of a writer, but emerges as a confluence of many social factors, such as reader, goal, reality, and task (Prior, 1998). Writers are thus encouraged to adapt the choices and possibilities to accommodate the needs of the given social factors. By integrating the task-based perspective into the notion of genre, this study designed genre-based tasks that were intended to engage learners to focus primarily on the conveyance of meaning within a concrete rhetorical situation that closely resemble one they might encounter in real life. For example, in an email writing
task, the writers were asked to make at least two requests (goal) to the school improvement committee (reader). Similarly, in a summary writing task, the students were asked to explain the gist of the article about genetic engineering (goal) to senior students who were not familiar with the content of the text (reader). Although these rhetorical situations were devised artificially by the instructor, interactive contexts can be created even in the act of writing in a way that it enhances student engagement while conveying the meaning, i.e., if the instructor can respond to their products as the reader. These conveyance-of-meaning-oriented writing tasks can thus be implemented by linking the two theoretical notions of task and genre such that it enables students to be both sensitized to the lexicogrammatical items and rules and offers opportunities to develop the underlying procedural knowledge. From the perspective of L2 writing research, the notion of task may provide a renewed understanding of effective genre learning that could lead to a cross-sectioning of writing pedagogy with an approach that explicitly addresses language learning.
Appendix A

Email writing scoring guidelines

*(Based on the TOEIC “respond to a written request” scoring guideline)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Task description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | An email at this level  
- clearly conveys the information, requests, and suggestions, etc., required by the prompt.  
- is characterized by the tone and register of the request appropriate for the intended audience.  
- uses organizational logic or appropriate connecting words or both to create coherence among sentences.  
- contains a few isolated errors in grammar or usage but do not obscure the writer’s meaning. |
| 4     | An email at this level  
- is mostly successful but falls short in addressing one of the tasks required by the prompt.  
- shows some awareness of the intended audience.  
- may omit, respond unsuccessfully, or respond incompletely to ONE of the required tasks.  
- uses organizational logic or appropriate connecting words in at least part of the email.  
- contains noticeable errors in grammar and usage; ONE sentence may contain errors that obscure meaning. |
| 3     | An email at this level  
- may show little awareness of the intended audience.  
- may address only ONE of the required tasks or may unsuccessfully or incompletely address TWO or THREE of the required tasks.  
- is characterized by missing or obscure connections between ideas.  
- contains errors in grammar and usage that obscure meaning in MORE THAN ONE sentence. |
| 2     | An email at this level |
- is seriously flawed and conveys little information, requests, and suggestions, etc., required by the prompt.
- is characterized by the tone or register that may be inappropriate for the intended audience.
- addresses NONE of the required tasks, although it may include some content relevant to the prompt.
- is characterized by missing or obscure connections between ideas.
- contains frequent errors in grammar and usage that obscure the writer’s meaning most of the time.

1 An email at this level
- merely copies words from the prompt, rejects the topic or is otherwise not connected to the topic.
- is entirely inappropriate to a given context.
- is characterized by poor control of connections between ideas.
- is predominantly incomprehensible because of many errors.
Appendix B

Summary writing scoring guidelines

(Based on the TOEFL writing test scoring guidelines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Task description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | A summary at this level  
|       | - successfully selects the important information from the source text.  
|       | - coherently and accurately presents main points with accurately connected key supporting ideas.  
|       | - has occasional language errors that do no result in inaccurate presentation of content. |
| 4     | A summary at this level  
|       | - is generally good in selecting the important information from the source text.  
|       | - coherently and accurately presents main points, but it may have minor omission, inaccuracy, vagueness, or imprecision of some supporting ideas.  
|       | - has more frequent or noticeable minor language errors that do not result in anything more than an occasional lapse of clarity or in the connection of ideas. |
| 3     | A summary at this level is marked by one or more of the following:  
|       | - the overall response conveys vague, global, unclear, or imprecise connection of the points made in the source text.  
|       | - the response may omit one major key point made in the source text.  
|       | - some key points or their connection with supporting ideas may be incomplete, inaccurate, or imprecise.  
|       | - more frequent errors of usage and/or grammar may result in noticeably vague expressions or obscured meanings in conveying ideas and connections. |
| 2     | A summary at this level is marked by one or more of the following:  
|       | - the response significantly misrepresents or completely omits the overall connection between some major key points and supporting ideas.  
|       | - the response significantly omits or significantly misrepresents important points made in the source text. |
the response contains language errors that largely obscure connections or meaning at key junctures, or that would likely obscure understanding of key ideas for a reader not already familiar with the source information.

1 A summary at this level is marked by one or more of the following:
   - The response provides little or no meaningful or relevant coherent content from the source text.
   - The language level of the response is so low that it is difficult to derive meaning.
Appendix C
In-school Placement Test
平成22年度 英語クラス分けテスト

合図があるまで問題用紙を開いてはいけません。

机の上に学生証を提示して下さい。筆記用具、時計、学生証以外のものを机の上に置いてはいけません。携帯電話を時計代わりに使うことはできませんので、機の上には置かないで下さい。

解答はすべて答案用紙（マークシート）に HB の黒鉛筆で記入すること。解答を始める前に、必ず学籍番号（受験番号）・氏名（漢字・カナ）を記入し、学籍番号と氏名のカナに対応する番号を正確にマークして下さい。

問題用紙にも、表紙（このページ）の下に学科・学年・学籍番号・氏名を記入して下さい。

解答にあたっては問題番号を間違えないように注意して下さい。また、今回は解答欄の1〜4以外の選択肢および第4〜1間以降の解答欄は関係ありませんので、関係のない番号をマークしないようにして下さい。

試験開始後すぐにリスニング問題を始めます。リスニング問題の選択肢は、問題用紙の最初(問1〜15)に印刷してあります。問題は続けて読まれますので注意して下さい。予め選択肢に目を通しておくことをお勧めします。

聞き取り問題開始後の途中入室は認めません。また、試験終了まで途中退室は認めません。ただし、体調不良などやむを得ない事情のある者は、携帯して監督者に申し出て下さい。

解答時間は40分です。

終了後、問題用紙・解答用紙ともに回収します。監督者の指示に従って下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>学科</th>
<th>学年</th>
<th>学籍番号</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>氏名</th>
<th>　　　</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I. LISTENING

例題
1. No, thank you.
2. Yes, please.
3. Let’s see.
4. You’re welcome.

(1)
1. I just got back from a party.
2. I lost my wallet on the train.
3. We don’t have that much time.
4. I wouldn’t like that.

(2)
1. Please drop by anytime.
2. It’s convenient to shop.
3. We might be neighbors.
4. I have thought about it.

(3)
1. I was ready an hour ago.
2. Maybe you need to plan better.
3. I haven’t spent it all yet.
4. Perhaps that’s not his business.

(4)
1. That’s the last train of the day.
2. I try not to make guesses.
3. Training people can be difficult.
4. Please put the coffee away.
1. That’s to be expected.
2. I can’t help but worry.
3. How much would you like?
4. That’s good to hear.

第二部

1. Much longer than half an hour.
2. About half an hour.
3. Only two hours.
4. More than two hours.

1. The green one.
2. The red one.
3. The green and red ones.
4. Neither one.

1. She got sick.
2. She got in an automobile accident.
3. Someone hit her.
4. Someone knocked into her.

1. Travel abroad.
2. Make a purchase.
3. Go into business.
4. Ask someone for a date.

1. He retired.
2. He wanted to go back to school.
3. He needed to look for another job.
4. He got fired.

第三部
(11)
1. 7:00 a.m.
2. 8:10 a.m.
3. 9:00 a.m.
4. 10:00 a.m.

(12)
1. He likes math more than any other subject.
2. Social Studies is his favorite subject.
3. He is best at science.
4. Physical education is what he specializes in.

(13)
1. It will be the biggest help in France.
2. It will be the most helpful in Spain an Italy.
3. It will be the most helpful in England.
4. It will be the most convenient in England and France.

(14)
1. He doesn’t have any.
2. He only has one.
3. He already has two.
4. He already has three.

(15)
1. His wife doesn’t want to go.
2. He can’t find the time.
3. He doesn’t have enough money.
4. His wife doesn’t want to wait for him.
II. GRAMMAR

Choose the best answer to fill in the blank.

(16) My brother’s daughter Natsuki is my favorite (     ).
   1. cousin  2. niece  3. nephew  4. aunt

(17) A white and sweet thing that is used in cooking is (     ).
   1. salt  2. pepper  3. flour  4. sugar

(18) I was so sick yesterday that I could (     ) walk.
   1. possibly  2. hardly  3. rarely  4. lately

(19) Scientists are (     ) about the information they will gather about Jupiter.
   1. excite  2. exciting  3. excited  4. to excite

(20) The IOC chose Vancouver, Canada, to (     ) the winter Olympic Games of 2010.
   1. take place  2. make  3. hold  4. be given

(21) Among 20% of the world’s land surface (     ) of permanently frozen soil.
   1. consists  2. is made  3. made up  4. is covered

(22) I would highly recommend this book. It’s (     ) reading.
   1. effective  2. convenient  3. important  4. worth

(23) (     ) his age of 85, my grandfather still retains decent physical fitness.
   1. Despite  2. Since  3. Although  4. Due to

(24) Using the wind to (     ) electronic power has become profitable in the United States.
   1. produce  2. product  3. prove  4. protect

(25) A: “Why can’t I do what I want to do?”
   B: “Well, I think you have the wrong (     ) of freedom. There is no freedom without responsibility.”
   1. means  2. task  3. look  4. idea
(26) A: “How did you do on the test?”
    B: “Unfortunately, I ( ) out of time and couldn’t finish it.”
    1. took    2. ran    3. came    4. gave

(27) A: “I want to send this package. How much is it?”
    B: “It depends ( ) how you want to send.”
    1. for    2. in    3. of    4. on

(28) A: “I see your teacup is ( ). Would you like some more?”
    B: “No, thank you. I’ve had enough.”
    1. short    2. little    3. small    4. empty

(29) A: “Would you like to ( ) now?”
    B: “I think I’ll have the fish.”
    1. request    2. order    3. require    4. bring

(30) A: “Let’s go out for dinner.”
    B: “That ( ) great.”
    1. seems    2. looks    3. hears    4. sounds
III. READING

Read the passage below and choose the best answer for each question.

1. What is your favorite color? Do you like yellow, orange, and red? If you do, you must be optimist, a leader, an active person who enjoys life, people, and excitement. Do you prefer grays and blues? Then you are probably quiet, shy, and you’d rather follow than lead. You tend to be pessimist. At least, this is what psychologists tell us, and they have been seriously studying the meaning of color preference, as well as the effect that colors have on human beings, for many years. They tell us, among other facts, that we don’t choose our favorite color as we grow up—we are born with our preference. If you happen to love brown, you did so as soon as you first opened your eyes.

Colors do influence our moods, there is no doubt about it. A yellow room makes most people feel more cheerful and more at ease than a dark green one; and a red dress brings warmth and cheer to the saddest winter day. On the other hand, black is depressing. A black bridge over the Thames River, near London, used to be the scene of more suicides than any other bridge in the area—until it was repainted green. The number of suicides fell sharply; perhaps it would have fallen even more if the bridge had been repainted pink.

Light and bright colors make people not only happier but also more active. It is an established fact that factory workers work better, harder, and have fewer accidents when their machines are painted orange rather than black or dark gray.

We often associate a particular color with a piece of music, a book, play, person, or feeling. A tragic story might make you think of black, while love stories vary from red to pink—or maybe light blue?

(31) Our color preferences are determined
1. when we can first see clearly
2. when we wake up
3. as we grow up
4. before we are born

(32) The bridge over the Thames River was the scene of many suicides because it was
1. painted black
2. painted green
3. painted pink
4. near London
(33) If the bridge had been repainted pink, the suicide rate
1. would have decreased more
2. might have decreased more
3. wouldn’t have changed
4. would have increased

(34) You might think of black if you had just read a
1. comedy 2. sad story 3. detective story 4. love story

(35) Which of the following titles best describes the content of this passage?
1. The meaning of color
2. The psychological effect of colors on human beings
3. The relationship between colors and work quality
4. The causal relationship between colors and suicide rate

次ページにも問題があります
Sometimes, things that make food taste good are very bad for us. We know that eating too much sugar and salt is unhealthy. Doctors now say that trans fat is another dangerous food ingredient. There is a huge push to ban its use.

Trans fat is used to prepare many kinds of food. It adds flavor and helps food last longer. It also makes food like cookies and French fries crunchy. However, doctors say that it raises our bad cholesterol level. That can cause health problems like heart disease.

But people are fighting back. Cities like New York and Philadelphia have banned the use of trans fat in restaurants. Also, fast-food chains like KFC and McDonald’s are removing trans fat from their products. They are replacing it with healthier ingredients like soybean oil.

Products sold in supermarkets are also changing. In some countries, companies must list a product’s trans fat amount on the label. Many packages proudly display in large letters that they have “0 Trans Fat.”

Doctors will be happy to see the end of trans fat in our diets. But they still insist on two important points. First, eating too much of other types of fat can also be unhealthy. Second, no matter what you eat, exercise is important to stay healthy.

(36) What is the main idea of this passage?
1. People need exercise to stay healthy
2. Several cities are banning trans fat
3. There are many ways to avoid getting sick
4. Trans fat, though tasty, is unhealthy.

(37) Why are many foods made with trans fat?
1. Most other kinds of fat are banned.
2. Companies are required by law to do so.
3. It is cheaper than all other types of fat.
4. Food made with trans fat may last longer.
(38) What are cities like Philadelphia doing about trans fat?
1. They have prohibited all restaurants from using it.
2. They are trying to get supermarket labels changed.
3. They are making some restaurants list trans fat amounts.
4. They are thinking about new laws to limit its use.

(39) Which of the following is NOT true?
1. Healthy people do more than just avoid trans fat.
2. All products in supermarkets now have zero trans fat.
3. In New York, restaurants may not cook with trans fat.
4. Eating trans fat leads to higher bad cholesterol levels.

(40) What does the word level in line 6 mean?
1. amount
2. stage
3. even
4. flat
Appendix D

Background questionnaire

● Beginning of the Spring 2010 semester

I. About writing in Japanese (Based on Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002)

1. How often did the following activities take place in your Japanese language classes?
l= never, 2 = not very often, 3 = somewhat often, 4 = very often
   a. reading and interpreting literary work (e.g., poetry, fiction)
     1      2      3      4
   b. reading and interpreting modern prose (e.g., essays)
     1      2      3      4
   c. writing personal impressions of fiction or non-fiction you read
     1      2      3      4
   d. writing essays or reports
     1      2      3      4
   e. learning how to evaluate the content of what you read
     1      2      3      4

2. What abilities do you think were emphasized as goals in the Japanese language classes you took? (check as many as apply)
   a. developing ability to appreciate literary work
   b. developing ability to write compositions
   c. developing ability to read and comprehend modern prose
   d. increasing your knowledge of vocabulary/grammar
   e. developing ability to evaluate content of reading and form your own ideas

3. How often did you do the following kinds of writing in your Japanese language classes?
l= never, 2 = not very often, 3 = somewhat often, 4 = very often
   a. personal impressions of materials you read (dokusyokansoobun)
     1      2      3      4
   b. compositions (short essays about a given topic including your own opinions, syooronbun)
4. How important do you think the following features were for your Japanese language teachers reading your writing? (Check as many as apply)
   a. organization of your ideas
   b. grammatical errors
   c. development of the content
   d. originality
   e. expressing your true ideas honestly
   f. no idea (None of my writing has been evaluated or commented by my previous teachers / I don’t have a substantial amount of writing experience)

5. Have you ever been taught about how to write in Japanese?
   a. Yes (Where? What did you learn? ________________________________)
   b. No
   c. I don’t remember.

II. About writing in English (Based on Sasaki & Hirose, 1996)

1. Which of the following activities did you do regularly in high school? (Check as many as apply.)
   a. translating individual Japanese sentences into English
   b. writing English sentences to practice grammar and/or vocabulary
   c. combining short sentences into one longer (complex/compound) sentence
   d. writing more than one paragraph
   e. summarizing what you read
   f. writing emails and letters
   g. other (Please specify)
   h. few opportunities to write in school

2. Which of the following kinds of writing did you do in high school? (Check as many as
apply.)
a. journal  
b. personal impressions of materials read  
c. literary work (stories, poems, etc.)  
d. summaries and paraphrases of materials read  
e. short expository papers  
f. letters and emails  
g. others (Please specify)  

3. Please estimate the amount of required writing (not translation into English) you did while in high school.
a. more than ten papers per term  
b. 5-10 pages per term  
c. 2-5 pages per term  
d. about a page per term  
e. none  

4. Which of the following kinds of writing did you do on your own (not connected to school work) before coming to the university? (Check as many apply.)
a. journal  
b. personal impressions of materials read  
c. literary work (stories, poems, etc)  
d. summaries of paragraphs of materials read  
e. short expository papers  
f. letters and emails  
g. others  
h. no writing opportunities on my own  

5. Please estimate the amount of self-initiated writing that you did before you entered the university.
a. more than ten pages per term  
b. 5-10 pages per term  
c. 2-5 pages per term  
d. about a page per term
About email writing experience

6. To what extent do/did you have the opportunities to write emails in English?
   1 = never, 2 = not very often, 3 = somewhat often, 4 = very often
   1  2  3  4

7. Have you even been taught about how to write emails in English?
   a. Yes (Where? Which class?)
   b. No

8. If your answer is Yes for the question 7, please specify what rules or conventions you learned.

About summary writing experience

9. To what extent do/did you have the opportunities to summarize what you read in English?
   1 = never, 2 = not very often, 3 = somewhat often, 4 = very often
   1  2  3  4

10. Have you ever been taught how to summarize in English?
    a. Yes (Where? Which class?)
    b. No

11. If your answer is Yes for the question 10, please specify what rules or conventions you learned.

About beliefs about writing genres

12. Please tell me what is good email in your opinion. For example, if you write a request email to someone, how do you start writing? Are there any strategies you use? What kinds of things come up to your mind when writing?
13. In your opinion, what are the most important things to remember when you are summarizing a text that you have read?
Appendix E

Needs analysis

1. English skills required for the students
Among the four basic skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, which skill do you think is the most important for the students at this university? Give reasons for your opinion, if possible.

2. The goal of English education
What kinds of skills and abilities would you like the students to have gained when they have completed the two-year compulsory English curriculum?

3. Free description
If you have any specific needs and suggestions for our English program, please write them here.
Appendix F
Coding guideline for interpersonal grammatical metaphor

1. Definition of interpersonal grammatical metaphor

Interpersonal grammatical metaphors express modal meanings outside the clause, for instance, by means of a subordinating clause, e.g., *I’d appreciate it if you could send me the information*. As this example shows, additional syntactic layers enable the writer to show his or her point of view and thus indicate his or her attempts to create a modal meaning (Halliday & Matthiesen, 2004). In the context of writing a formal request email, subordinating clauses play a role in mitigating the strength of a request.

1.1 Incongruent request forms

Following SFL, the mitigating resources for making requests are defined as interpersonal grammatical metaphors that make the request more marked and incongruent. Four types of incongruent request forms were identified in the students’ genre production data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Interrogatives</td>
<td>- <em>Could you please publish a free paper to let us know more about Atsugi city?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using <em>could</em></td>
<td>- <em>Could you try to improve the environment around the station?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Interrogatives</td>
<td>- <em>Do you think that it would be possible to create a car parking and permit students to go to school by car?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using <em>possible</em></td>
<td>- <em>Would it be possible to prepare individual lockers for students?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) If-clauses using <em>I wonder</em></td>
<td>- <em>I wonder if you could tell the student office staff to behave properly.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was wondering if you could consider creating a shopping mall in the city.

(4) If-clauses using appreciate or grateful

- I’d appreciate it if you could allow us to control the air conditioner to make a room more comfortable for students.
- I would be grateful if you could make cycling lanes on main road.

1.2 Congruent request forms

The students’ genre production data also included unmitigated, prototypical, and less metaphorical request expressions that are often created by a single clause or lexical phrasal forms. On the basis of SFL, these types of request forms are defined as congruent request forms in the present study. Four types of congruent request forms were identified in the students’ genre production data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Imperatives</td>
<td>- Please create a non-smoking area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Please increase the number of street lamps in the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Obligation</td>
<td>- You must increase the number of bus services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statements</td>
<td>- The cafeteria must be open until a later hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Illocutionary</td>
<td>- I request the lowering price of cafeteria food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>- I request that the cafeteria will extend opening hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) want-based</td>
<td>- I want to study in a nicer and more comfortable environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>- I want you to improve cafeteria service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G
Coding guideline for ideational grammatical metaphor

1. Definition of ideational grammatical metaphors

Ideational grammatical metaphors are nominalized expressions that condense the source information into the summarized text. In SFL studies, the use of ideational grammatical metaphors has been found to play a key role in making a summary more effective, as it enables the reduction, generalization, and integration of information from the source in a way that avoids plagiarism (Drury, 1991; Hood, 2008), resulting in more sophisticated “thing-oriented” scientific texts (Schlepegrell, 2004b).

1.1 Incongruent ways of summarization

In SFL, ideational grammatical metaphors by means of nominalization are described as incongruent ways of summarizing the text. Following Halliday & Matthiesen (1999), four types of ideational grammatical metaphors were coded in the students’ genre production data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Shift from quality (adjectives) to thing (nouns)</td>
<td>The original text: We can use our knowledge to take vegetables and grow larger ones which have more nutrition and better flavor. In other words, we can improve on nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The summarized text;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The effective use of plant genetics brings us more varieties of vegetables in size, nutrition, and flavor.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (2) Shift from process (verbs) to thing (nouns) | The original text: Breeders are able to use hormones to get prize cows to produce hundreds of eggs.  
The summarized text: High quality cows can be produced by means of artificial insemination. |
|---|---|
| (3) Shift from circumstance (prepositional phrases, adverbs) to thing (nouns) | The original text: Certainly this knowledge must be used wisely and not foolishly.  
The summarized text: The author emphasizes a wise, ethically-accepted use of this knowledge. |
| (4) Shift from relator (conjunctive processes) to thing (nouns) | The original text: Plant geneticists are able to produce new species of food plants by special treatment. (...) Genetic engineering is also important for improving the quality of farm animals.  
The summarized text: The author describes the development of biotechnology and its effects on plant and animal breeding. |

### 1.2 Congruent ways of summarization

The students’ genre production data also included more congruent, prototypical, and less metaphorized ways of summarizing the text. The congruent ways of summarization include using synonyms, breaking one long sentences into two separate ones, changing the order of ideas, and changing sentence patterns. On the basis of SFL, these types of request forms are described as congruent request forms in the present study. Four types of congruent request forms were identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) Using synonyms            | The original text:                                                                                      
|                               | Although genes decide the features that an individual may have, the way those features develop is also dependent upon the environment.                                                                                   |
|                               | The summarized text:                                                                                     
|                               | *Although genes decide the features that an individual may have, the individual features are also influenced by the environment.*                                                                                 |
| (2) Breaking one long sentences into two separate ones. | The original text:                                                                                      
|                               | What really takes place in the process of heredity remained a mystery until scientific research began to provide clearer information about the principles of how one organism inherits qualities from a parent organism. |
|                               | The summarized text:                                                                                     
|                               | *The process of heredity had a mystery. However, scientific research began to illuminate the mystery.*                                                                                                       |
| (3) Changing the order of ideas | The original text:                                                                                      
|                               | Cells from the unborn child can indicate other genetic abnormalities, and thus the child can be treated quite early.                                                                                           |
|                               | The summarized text:                                                                                     
|                               | *The child can be treated quite early if cells from the child can indicate other genetic abnormalities.*                                                                                            |
| (4) Changing sentence patterns | The original text:                                                                                      
|                               | Mankind has understood the influence of heredity since prehistoric times and has used the principles of heredity to improve the quality of crops and livestock.                                                |
|                               | The summarized text:                                                                                     
|                               | *The principles of heredity has been used by mankind since prehistoric times to improve the quality of crops and livestock.*                                                                                  |
Appendix H

A genre-based model: A blog entry (description)*

TOKYO NODAI HARVEST FESTIVAL
BY ET-CHAN NOVEMBER 10, 2008

On November 1st, I was at the brewing ground where they prepare the next generation of agriculture, food, and brewing industry leaders in Japan. This was the first day of the annual school festival at the Tokyo University of Agriculture, or Tokyo Nodai, during their shukakusai or harvest festival. Being one of the top universities to study agriculture, food science, and brewing science, many sake brewers send their next generation to Tokyo Nodai or hire graduates from there.

One of the initiatives widely known in the sake brewing industry in recent years lead by Nodai alumni is the use of hana kobo, or yeast from flowers. They brewed sake using kobo from flowers like caryophyllaceae or rhodondendron. Here’s the link to the list of sake breweries who are active in this initiative (in Japanese). This university is also known for other research and developments. Also, one of the members of the fermentation faculty and noted food writer, Dr. Takeo Koizumi, is someone everyone associates with the school. One other thing this school is most known for is the daikon odori-laterally translated, turnip dance. If you have a hard time picturing what this peculiar dance is all about you’re not alone, so I posted some video excerpts below.

On the first day of the harvest festival event, I was guided by one of the wonderful and very enthusiastic Tokyo Nodai alumni to weave through the mad house campus filled with food stalls and people in the early afternoon. She warned me ahead of time that if we did not get there early, I would miss great items like honey, miso, bacon, or jam. Each stall represents associations or special research groups studying under a professor (kenkyushitsu) and sell the products they study at this event: some are organic, some are made right in the lab at the university.

She also said there were tons of food stalls to eat from, so come hungry. I did not take her seriously thinking of my own school festival experience, but as soon as I got to the Odakyu Kyodo Station, I started to get the idea. Twenty minutes walk from the station there was an uninterrupted line of people striding down the street to get to their food destination. When I got to the campus, the miso was all gone, there was about 2 hours wait for a bottle of honey from the most popular group, and the tickets from the bacon stall were all gone in a second. Looking at these long lines where everyone waited in line all over the campus so patiently and
quietly, for a second, I thought I was in some Soviet backwater where I had to queue up for food.

As soon as I saw a bulletin board listing all 113 food stalls, I said “so many food stalls, a bit different from your regular gakusai.” Then my trusted guide looked at me funny and said, “This school is all about food!” I guess there’s not much else. These 113 businesses were selected by the festival out of hundreds of applications, based on the soundness of their business plans. Then, out of the proposals that passed the selection process, there’s a Michelin-like rating system on the day of the event. They go through a real-world experience during this three day marathon.

I had an apple pie, tori dango soup, udon with sweet and soy sauce from a body building club’s stall, Mongolian fried gyoza from a Monglian students group, a Taiwanese sausage, and right before I left, had a sake manju and special amazake from the stall run by Dr. Takeo Koizumi’s students. This rather unique amazake was made with kuro koji, Aspergillus awamori, koji mold which is used for making awamori not sake. Contrary to its title sweet sake, this black koji amazake was really sour, not sweet at all. I really enjoyed this unusual sour purplish, porridge-like warm drink.

Now, back to their famous or notorious daikon odori. I have to do a bit more research on its history and why it is so big, but I believe, this is one of those things you had to go through one way or another if you went to Nodai. On the way back to the station, my friend and volunteer Nodai guide for the day, shared her own little episode about the dance.

The extent to which their alumni go back to school with such total devotion is quite amazing. She was at her friend’s wedding reception in a formal dress. After all the speeches were over and when a group of male Nodai graduates, friends of the groom, got up on the stage with daikon in their hands, she was horrified. She knew what was coming. She was summoned to the stage to join the band. I pictured this charming young lady in a nice elegant black evening dress, doing this daikon odori routine with two long, shiny, whole white turnips in her hands instead of pom-poms, also with the greens still on, in front of the wedding crowd, and I could not help laughing so hard.

This is a bit of an unusual spot to visit, but if you are looking for interesting food like pancakes made with emu eggs or food and beverage related books in Japanese, you might want to stop at Tokyo Nodai’s student co-op. Or just stop at their cafeteria to have a bowl of oyakodon and chat with these bright and very enthusiastic students who will lead Japan’s future agriculture, food, and brewing industry—and hopefully at the same time, pass on these beautiful traditions to the next generation.

* Received from: http://tokyofoodcast.com/index.php/et-chan/tokyo-nodai-harvest-festival/228/
Appendix I

A mode-based model: A five-paragraph essay (description)*

Animals in the wild have many natural enemies. A small bird wants to avoid being seen by a hawk, a zebra doesn’t want the lion to find him, and a flatfish would prefer that the shark swim quietly by. If an animal can’t easily run away from its predator, how can it protect itself? One way that has evolved over time is protective coloring, or camouflage. Many animals find security in blending in with their environment.

In birds, for example, while adult males are brightly colored and very noticeable, adult females and young chicks are light brown or sand-colored in order to blend into their background and escape the sharp eyes of a predator. Consider the bright red cardinal, a very common bird in colder areas of North America. The male is bright and showy to attract a mate, but you hardly ever see the females. They are sandy brown, with touches of red on the wings, tail, and breast. The peacock is another bird where the male is bright and showy, while the female is easily overlooked because of her dull coloring. The long tail feathers of the male are generally bright green and gold and have round markings of a rich color, known as peacock blue. The female, called a peahen, has short tail feathers and is much less colorful than the male. In short, adopting camouflage colors helps the female birds survive and raise another generation of birds.

Many mammals have also adopted the colors of their surroundings. A zebra is almost invisible among the branches and stripes of sunlight in its native Africa because its black and white stripes mimic the shadows among the trees and bushes. A lion is very hard to see when it is sleeping on the beige sand of the plains. The lioness, in particular, looks just like a part of the ground until she raises her head. The camouflage of the lioness makes her invisible to her prey, so she can concentrate on hunting and feeding her young. All these mammals have, over many, many years, developed this protective coloring to assist them in the struggle to survive.

Ocean dwellers use camouflage as well. Most fish are darker on top than on the bottom; from above, they look like the land at the bottom of the water, and from below, they look like the water’s surface. Many ocean fish have a horizontal line along their body that separates the top from the bottom. An ocean mackerel, for example, is easily distinguished by this stripe. Some flatfish have taken this protection a step further; for example, a fish that lives on a sandy bottom has a light-brown upper side, while a flatfish that lives on a rocky bottom has an upper side that looks like pebbles. The result is, because they look just like their surroundings, these fish survive and avoid becoming someone else’s lunch.

In summary, looking like their environment is helpful to these animals for the survival of the species. The mother bird that is invisible among the brown leaves, the lion sleeping on the sandy plains, and the fish that hides among the pebbles will live to see another day. The safety these animals find in their protective coloring has helped them to survive over the ages.

*Boardman & Frydenberg, 2008, p. 55
Appendix J

Examples of prototypical genre models (Based on Follet, A. et al., 2008)

The two email samples presented below are written by the same person (Jon) for the same functional goal (to make an appointment), but each is addressed to different recipients (Mr. Yamato and Mari). Mr. Yamato is Jon’s client, and Mari is Jon’s friend. This setting thus assumes that Jon’s appointment email to Mr. Yamato is written more formally than his email to Mari.

**Making appointments (formal)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dear Mr. Yamato,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As mentioned in my email of 2 September, I am planning to be in Tokyo next week to attend the international conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wonder if it would be possible for you to meet me on Friday, 10 September at our exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would appreciate it if you could call me within the next few days to confirm this appointment, or if necessary, to propose an alternative arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very much looking forward to meeting you son in Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regards,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Making appointments (informal)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hi Mari,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s such a short notice, but I am wondering if you might be free for lunch tomorrow. As I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will be in Kichijoji area tomorrow morning, it would be good to meet you if you’re available for lunch.

If this is not good for you, please let me know your convenient date, time and venue. I will adjust my schedule accordingly.

Look forward to hearing from you.

See you soon,

Jon
Appendix K
Prompts for the target tasks

Assignment 1.
Dr. and Mrs. Lewis Sams invited you to their housewarming party. A lot of guests showed up, and everyone was very friendly. The food was excellent. You had a great time there. Write an email to Dr. and Mrs. Lewis Sam to show your appreciation.

Assignment 2.
In July 2008, Author Yang Yi won the Akutagawa Prize to become the first nonnative Japanese speaker to receive the prestigious literary award. Her award winning work “Tokiga nijimu asa” (literally “A morning when time blurs”) is set during and after China’s democratization movement centering on the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre. Yang said, “I’m very happy. I feel I have been accepted.” Write an email to Yang Yi to congratulate her.

Assignment 3.
James, an international student who has just arrived in Tokyo, is eager to have new experiences in Japan. Autumn is the season for many Japanese universities to hold their annual school festivals, this might be a good opportunity for him to learn about Japanese culture. Write an email to James to invite him to our university’s Shuukakusai (Harvest Festival) and explain to him about some interesting notable features of our Shuukakusai.

Assignment 4.
You are planning to travel in a foreign country during the summer holiday. However, you are not rich enough, and you need to make a cheap trip. Write an email to HIS to ask for information about a cheap travel package to your destination.

Assignment 5.
You are interested in applying for the position of a horticultural therapist advertised in the June 23 issue of the Japan Times (the advertisement was attached to the assignment paper). Write an application email and explain who you are, what you can do, and what experiences you possess that might make you a strong candidate.
## Appendix L

**Model summaries used for pedagogic task**

1. According to the article “The Disappearance of Wildlife,” many wildlife species as well as tropical forests disappear as a result of increasing human activities.

2. In the article “The Disappearance of Wildlife,” the author reports that an increasing number of wildlife species is vanishing from the globe and are in danger of extinction. According to the author, a major reason for the extinction is human activities, such as thoughtless hunting of these animals and exporting of them to many countries. To solve this problem, the United Nations Environment Program takes measures for special protection of endangered animals. The author concludes that global cooperation is essential to prevent wildlife from dying out.

3. The article “The Disappearance of Wildlife” says that as human activities increase, not only tropical forests but many species of wildlife are disappearing from the earth. The author points out that if over-hunting continues in the future, many species on this planet will become extinct. According to the author, people hunt wildlife for profit and export them to the United States, Germany, Japan, and other countries. The United Nations Environment Program keeps a watch on endangered species and their habitats and asks countries all over the world to give special protection to them. In the conclusion, the author argues that to save our irreplaceable earth and protect rare wildlife from extinction, global cooperation is needed.

### Original text

**The Disappearance of Wildlife**

As human activities increase, not only tropical forests but many species of wildlife are disappearing from the earth. At no time in the past has the number of endangered species of wild fauna and flora been larger than today. If over-hunting
continues in the future, many different kinds of species on this planet will become extinct. Once a species dies out, it is gone forever. There is no denying that one of the main reasons for the extinction of certain species is that humans have been hunting wild animals thoughtlessly for profit, and these animals, dead or alive, have been exported to the United States, Germany, Japan, and other countries. The United Nations Environment Program keeps a watch on endangered species and their habitats and asks countries all over the world to give special protection to them. To save our irreplaceable earth and protect rare wildlife from extinction, global cooperation is needed.
Appendix M
Self-assessment questionnaire

● End of the Spring 2010 semester*

1. Compared with the beginning of the semester, to what extent do you think that you have improved your ability to write emails in English

   1             2             3             4
   Not at all    A little       Somewhat    A lot

2. Compared with the beginning of the semester, to what extent do you think that you have changed your way of thinking about writing an email in English?

   1             2             3             4
   Not at all    A little       Somewhat    A lot

3. To the students who chose either of a little, somewhat, or a lot in the question (2), how and why do you think you have changed in the way you did?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

4. Please tell me what is good email in your opinion. For example, if you write a request email to someone, how do you start writing? Are there any strategies you use? What kinds of things come up to your mind when writing?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

* At the end of the fall 2010 semester, the same self-assessment questions were asked to the students regarding their summary writing experiences. One additional question posed at the end of the semester was as follows: What do you know now about summarizing a text that you didn’t know before taking this course? (Based on Wette 2010).
Source text 1

The science of genetics has gained increasing importance over the years. It is the branch of science which is concerned with heredity. Mankind has understood the influence of heredity since prehistoric times and has used the principles of heredity to improve the quality of crops and livestock. However, what really takes place in the process of heredity remained a mystery until scientific research began to provide clearer information about the principles of how one organism inherits qualities from a parent organism.

Briefly, genetics is the study of how genes function and how they are passed from parent to offspring. Although genes decide the features that an individual may have, the way those features develop is also dependent upon the environment. For example, the genes in green plants have the information necessary to make chlorophyll which makes them green, but if the plant is grown in the dark, then the gene responsible for the manufacture of chlorophyll no longer operates.

With the development of genetic techniques, there have been great advances in medicine so that inherited human disorders can be diagnosed and treated more effectively than they could be in the past. For example, certain families seem to have a genetic tendency to develop cancer or tuberculosis more than other families do. Cells from the unborn child can indicate other genetic abnormalities, and thus the child can be treated quite early. Although genetics is still a young field, the day will come when not only can such inherited disease be diagnosed, but they can be treated through genetic engineering even more effectively than they are now.

Eugenics is another branch of genetics and genetic engineering. The purpose of eugenics is to use genetics to improve human beings in all areas. This would mean that genetic engineering would be used to increase and improve the intelligence and appearance of the human race. Perhaps parents would be able to choose in advance the hair color, facial appearance and other characteristics of their unborn children. There is much debate as to how this should be used as well as much doubt about whether it is ethical to tamper with nature. How do you feel about this? Do you feel that we should
be able to have such control over our own heredity or do you feel that nature should be in charge of heredity?

Source text 2

Everyone knows what biology is because we have all studied it in high school. Literally, it means the study of life. But if you were asked what biotechnology is, what answer would you give? Biotechnology is taking the knowledge that we have from our study of biology and adapting it to our own needs and to those of the earth around us. It means not merely understanding the forces of life, but using those same forces to improve our own surroundings. Such a statement sounds very vague. More specifically, biotechnology is applying industrial know-how to biological functions in order to achieve certain goals on a large scale. For example, we can use our knowledge to take vegetables and grow larger ones which have more nutrition and better flavor. In other words, we can improve on nature.

Another aspect of biotechnology is called fermentation engineering. Fermentation is the process used in making bread, wine, and various types of whiskey. Through biotechnology, we can learn to expect the same results every time. There is also medical engineering, which uses an understanding of biological functions to create new medicines.

An important new branch of biotechnology is called genetic engineering. By altering the structure of the DNA of a cell, we can control heredity itself. Theoretically, people could decide in advance what their children are going to look like. In other ways, it may be the solution to finding cures for cancer and for hereditary diseases such as hemophilia. Some people think this is good and others think it is tampering too much with nature. Certainly this knowledge must be used wisely and not foolishly.

Perhaps you have heard the word “clone.” It is a word which is often heard these days and simply means a copy. One aspect of genetic engineering is called cloning and, theoretically at least, it means the ability to produce identical organism in quantity. Perhaps it could be used to produce animals or vegetables for food, but some people are frightened of the idea. They think it could be used to produce unthinking and obedient armies of human robots. They also think it is playing with nature too much.

What do you think of genetic engineering? Does it frighten you or intrigue you? In what ways do you think it might be dangerous? Do you think it is playing with nature too much?
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