

## Chapter 2

### **Rhetorical Consciousness-Raising, Genre Awareness, and Awareness of Genres**

This chapter first examines rhetorical consciousness-raising, which was proposed by Swales (1990) and has since been adopted by other researchers and practitioners as the preferred instructional goal for the graduate-level research writing classroom. Since rhetorical consciousness raising is often discussed together with the concept of genre, three approaches to genre analysis will be introduced. Because many students need to learn discipline-related genre-specific features, the notion of rhetorical consciousness-raising is used with regard to two interrelated instructional objectives: (1) to develop students' awareness of genre analysis as a conceptual framework (genre awareness) for guiding their further examination of genre samples in the graduate-level writing classroom and beyond and (2) to increase students' awareness of discipline-specific features in research genres (awareness of genres, the plural form, or discipline- and genre-specific features) through guiding them to become increasingly proficient in applying the genre analysis framework to their analysis of genre samples valued in their respective disciplines.

### Defining and Applying Rhetorical Consciousness-Raising

In what some (e.g., Lancaster, Aull, & Escudero, 2015) consider to be the most influential book on graduate-level research writing, *Genre Analysis*, Swales (1990) draws our attention to “the pedagogical value in sensitizing students to rhetorical effects, and to the rhetorical structures that tend to recur in genre-specific texts” (p. 213). He believes that participants in graduate-level research writing courses can benefit from our teaching if we guide them to learn to “schematize the structures of the sections [in research genres such as journal articles] themselves and so further develop an understanding of what it is that allows them to recognize a section as Method or Discussion” (p. 213). He elaborates as to why he believes sensitizing students to the rhetorical effects of important discipline-oriented research genres should constitute the instructional objective in the graduate writing classroom: By focusing on the rhetorical effects of texts, we sidestep the problem of heterogeneous content interests due to the multidisciplinary mix of students in a typical graduate-level writing class (see Chapter 1). Instead of arguing about disciplinary content, course participants are in the position of focusing on a common goal—making sense of how recurring genre-specific textual features may have certain rhetorical effects on them as readers and writers. Discussing the rhetorical effects of research texts in class can also help develop course participants’ increasing control of the metalanguage for discussing texts, such as “negotiation of knowledge claims,” “self-citation,” and “metadiscourse,” among others (p. 215). Developing the necessary metalanguage, Swales argues, provides course participants with a certain analytical perspective to help them critique their own and others’ writing.

In addition, reflecting on the rhetorical effects of textual features can add a “novelty” value to graduate-level writing class, according to Swales (1990, p. 215), and can help distinguish such a class from those content courses in students’ own disciplines. Similarly, focusing on the rhetorical elements in research texts, such as the communicative purposes and the

relationships between readers and writers, is likely to add to an instructor’s credibility, presenting the instructor as having something unique to contribute to students’ learning of research writing. In particular, Swales (1990) found that “colleagues from other discourse communities are both surprised and impressed when the English instructor arrives armed with lines of inquiry that show sensitivity to ... that community’s central genres” (p. 216; see also Swales, 2004; Swales & Luebs, 2002). Overall, Swales argues that raising students’ rhetorical consciousness benefits both students and instructors and creates a unique socio-rhetorical situation and a shared goal in the graduate-level writing classroom.

In subsequent publications, Swales expands on this theory. For example, Swales and a former student (Swales & Lindemann, 2002) have described an activity for teaching the literature review part-genre in which students and junior scholars “become more observant readers of the discursual conventions of their fields and thereby deepen their rhetorical perspectives on their disciplines” (p. 118). They show how rhetorical consciousness-raising deepens students’ perspectives on their own disciplines.

Rhetorical consciousness-raising has very clearly been stipulated as the instructional goal in the series of textbooks Swales coauthored with his colleague Christine Feak (Feak & Swales, 2009, 2011; Swales & Feak, 2000, 2009, 2011, 2012a). In the third edition of the widely adopted *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills*, for example, Swales and Feak (2012a) ask their readers to “apply their analytical skills to the discourses of their chosen disciplines and to explore how effective academic writing is achieved” (p. ix), a goal that is consistent with that of rhetorical consciousness-raising. In the other volumes, they advocate for the cycle of “Analysis→Awareness→Acquisition→Achievement” as essential in this regard (Swales & Feak, 2009, p. xiii). This cycle asks users to carry out linguistic and rhetorical analysis by comparing certain features of a text from a different field with what they know or can discover from texts in their own areas because “these comparisons lead to a greater awareness and understanding of how research English is constructed, which

then provide a platform for further acquisition of specific writing skills” (Swales & Feak, 2009, p. xiv). Again, rhetorical consciousness-raising as the instructional objective is believed to be able to lead to learners’ deepened understanding of their chosen field as well as their possible acceptance into the discourse community they aspire to join.

Rhetorical consciousness-raising as an instructional objective has been accepted by other practitioners of graduate-level research writing instruction. Starfield (2003), for example, describes how a thesis-writing course for both L1 and L2 students raises students’ awareness of the linguistic and the genre-specific structuring of theses/dissertations in the social sciences and humanities. Starfield (2003) highlighted the Creating a Research Space (CaRS) framework (Swales, 1990; Swales & Feak, 2012a) that often appears in the introductory sections of research articles and theses/dissertations to her students and then annotated the moves and sub-moves in the introductory sections of some sample theses. Through “deconstructing” the sample theses this way, Starfield (2003) aimed to raise her students’ rhetorical consciousness of how “the texts they are reading are constructed and contextualized and, at the same time, through exposure to a number of different theses, offer them a range of strategies for the construction of their own theses” (p. 143).

In another course titled Research Writing and Presentation, Starfield also set the goal of developing “students’ awareness of the structure of texts within their own discipline” because “explicitly raising awareness of these features will enable students to adopt or adapt them to their own writing.” She attributes such a goal to Swales’ notion of rhetorical consciousness-raising and believes that such a goal is “in line with current thinking in writing pedagogy” (Starfield, 2016, p. 183). She also noticed that her students’ feedback at the end of the course showed that they valued such a goal highly.

Hyland (2002) also argues for rhetorical consciousness-raising as an instructional objective in ESP teaching in general and in graduate-level research writing instruction in particular. Hyland has pointed out that a major problem of heterogeneous classes is finding enough common ground among students

for class discussions and activities. One solution to this problem, he believes, is to take advantage of the opportunities that such classes offer to contrast the class participants’ disciplinary experiences and expectations. He argues that activities aimed at rhetorical consciousness-raising not only satisfy students’ demands for personal relevance in graduate-level writing classes, but also develop their awareness of the functions of texts and how these functions are conventionally accomplished.

Others have seen rhetorical consciousness-raising to have pedagogical applications due to the language learning histories of the students in graduate-level communications classes. Tierney (2016), for example, describes how the many years of English language courses in their home countries and the resulting English language proficiency enables graduate students to contribute actively in class and to provide valuable feedback in groups. As a result, according to Tierney, “awareness-raising and metacognitive strategies” have been adopted as the instructional goals and teaching technique in the graduate-level communication courses at Yale University where Tierney directs the graduate communication support program (p. 275).

In 1995, Belcher and Braine used a different term to expand on this notion: “academic discursal consciousness-raising” (p. xv). In their view, this term involves developing in students the explicit awareness of “the texts, subtexts, and contexts of academic discourse” for students to “join the collectivist endeavors that academic community are” (p. xv). Note that Swales also talks about rhetorical consciousness-raising as important for helping students to understand discipline-specific discursal conventions. Belcher and Braine (1995) seem to have expanded on this notion to emphasize how academic discursal consciousness-raising can also help develop in students a sense of the sometimes hidden rules of what some call the *games* of academic writing and the strategies academic insiders often adopt to play such games (Casanave, 2002, 2014).

Hirvela (1997) has also identified as a goal of his graduate-level writing course to help students penetrate the invisible discourse of their fields. He describes the learning objectives

in his academic writing course for international graduate students as aiming to acquaint the students with what Belcher and Braine call the “subtexts and contexts” (1995, p. xv) of academic writing and sensitize them to the subtleties that constitute the invisible discourse they must learn to recognize and control if they are to acquire full membership in the discourse community they have elected to join (Hirvela, 1997). Similarly, Gustafsson, Eriksson, and Karlsson (2016) described the objective of their graduate-level research writing course that targets journal article writing at the Chalmers University of Technology in Sweden as aiming to “direct students’ attention to the rhetorical assumptions of the various communities in the [multidisciplinary] group to highlight the kinds of givens used to legitimize practice in the respective disciplinary discourses” (p. 262).

Rhetorical consciousness-raising also seems to have been perceived or accepted by relatively novice instructors as seen in the case of Michele reported in Tardy (2009).

In sum, starting with Swales (1990), scholars and practitioners of graduate-level research writing have identified rhetorical consciousness-raising as the suitable learning objective in their classroom. Such an objective includes raising students’ awareness of the “rhetorical structure” in “genre-specific texts” and the rhetorical effects of the rhetorical structure and its attendant linguistic features (Swales, 1990, p. 213). It encompasses deepening students’ awareness of the discursive conventions in students’ respective fields and their perspectives on their chosen disciplines (Swales & Lindemann, 2002; see also Belcher & Braine, 1995; L. Flowerdew, 2016; Gustafsson, Eriksson, Karlsson, 2016; Hirvela, 1997; Hyland, 2002; Starfield, 2003, 2016; Tierney, 2016). Rhetorical consciousness-raising has also been conceptualized as raising students’ awareness of the critical skills to read the rules of academic writing privileged by insiders of academic communities and raising students’ awareness of the “subtexts and contexts” of academic writing (Belcher & Braine, 1995; Swales et al., 2001).

### Raising Rhetorical Consciousness through Genre Analysis

When scholars have argued for the importance of rhetorical consciousness-raising, they often invoke the concept of genre. Swales (1990) has discussed sensitizing students to the rhetorical effects of *genre*-specific features as part of this process; he has cited some students’ failure to “call upon useful expectations as to how the introduction [in a journal article] might be rhetorically constructed” as the reason to raise their awareness of the rhetorical structure in key research *genres* (p. 214; emphasis added). He refers to the importance of presenting “prototypical examples of relevant *genres*” (p. 213; emphasis added) and to raise students’ awareness of the discursive conventions of students’ fields (Swales & Lindemann, 2002). Similarly, Belcher and Braine refer to the awareness of forms of academic discourse, or genres, as part of raising students’ rhetorical consciousness (1995).

In fact, in a review of the status of L2 writing research and practice, Belcher (2012) points out that “interest in addressing the very specialized discursive needs of novice EAL [English as an Additional Language] graduate writers has helped motivate ... one of the most highly theorized curricular orientations in L2 writing, namely, genre pedagogy” (p. 136; see also Hyland, 2004b; Paltridge, 2001). Referring to supporting graduate-level writing in general (rather than just L2 writing), Sundstrom (2016) points out that “*genre* and rhetorical approaches and methodologies have been tested and shown to work in interdisciplinary settings with skilled instructors” (p. 201; emphasis added).

Since scholars and instructors of graduate-level research writing often discuss rhetorical consciousness-raising in conjunction with genre, it would be important to explore what genre is, what genre pedagogy often entails, and why genre pedagogy is considered to be a “highly theorized” curricular orientation especially suitable for raising rhetorical consciousness and believed to have been “tested and shown to work” in the graduate-level research writing classroom.

Arguably, the most influential definition of genre, at least to those analyzing discipline-specific research genres and teaching research writing through a genre-focused approach, comes from Swales (1990):

A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style. Communicative purpose is both a privileged criterion and one that operates to keep the scope of a genre as here conceived narrowly focused on comparable rhetorical action. In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content, and intended audience. (p. 58)

Other ESP and EAP scholars have expanded on this definition of genre. Ann Johns and Diane Belcher have both highlighted the socio-rhetorical dimensions of genre, with Johns defining genre as “responses by speakers or writers to the demands of a social context” (2002, p. 3) and Belcher calling genre “socially agreed-upon ways of achieving communicative purposes” (2012, p. 136). Aiming for a more comprehensive definition of genre that emphasizes texts, subtexts, and contexts (see Belcher & Braine, 1995, and Hirvela, 1997, for their discussions of the three), Flowerdew defines genre as “a multifaceted construct characterized by a range of features including social action, communities of practice, power relations, text, and intertext” (2011, p. 120).

Genre-oriented scholars have identified three broad, inter-related approaches to genre by citing major differences in how genre is defined, how the research focus varies, and how research findings of target audiences differ (Hyon, 1996; see also Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010; Flowerdew, 2011; Hyland, 2004b; Johns, 2002; Paltridge, 2001). Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday, 1995) has been adopted by researchers examining

the broad genres or rhetorical modes, such as description, narration, and argumentation (Paltridge, 2001). The New Rhetoric approach is used mostly by rhetoric and composition scholars in North America who are especially interested in the social and ideological implications of genre (e.g., Bawarshi, 2003; Devitt, 2004; Devitt, Reiff, & Bawarshi, 2004). The English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approach (Swales, 1990, 2004) is often favored by researchers and practitioners interested in genre as a tool for teaching discipline-specific and peer-oriented writing to L2 users, including graduate-level research writers and beyond, in academic and professional settings.

Despite the distinctions among the three approaches, the divisions “have become much less sharp—even if they have not entirely disappeared” (Swales, 2009c, p. 4). “Consolidating trends” among the three schools have, in Swales’ view, pointed to a “more nuanced approach to genre awareness-raising and genre acquisition” (p. 5). As Swales (2009c) sees it, “The work of genre is to mediate between social situations and the texts that respond strategically to the exigencies of those situations” (p. 14). Therefore, genre analysis should focus on the interactions between social situations and texts, i.e., to track “textual regularities and irregularities and explain them in terms of the relevant and pertinent social circumstances and the rhetorical demands they engender” (Swales, 2009c, p. 14).

Despite this argument, novice practitioners interested in teaching research writing to graduate student writers may find it useful to start with the ESP approach to genre for at least three reasons: (1) the close attention given by the ESP approach to both the textual and the contextual aspects of genre, (2) the comparatively accessible analytical framework practiced by those adopting the ESP approach, and (3) the rich pedagogy-relevant research findings on research genres generated by those adopting the ESP approach to genre analysis.

The ESP approach to genre study has been noted as increasingly bridging the linguistic and rhetorical traditions in genre, thus exemplifying the “consolidating trends” Swales (2009c) suggests. This approach to genre “is becoming increasingly context-driven, and the overlap between the New Rhetoric. . .

and ESP research and theory . . . becomes greater every year” (Johns, 2003, p. 206). The connections between the linguistic and the rhetorical or, in Swales’ words, between “the texts” and the “social situations,” in the ESP approach can be seen in its emphasis on the role of discourse community, with its shared communicative purposes, in identifying, analyzing, and teaching genres (Swales, 2009c, p. 14).

More specifically, genre is often defined as structured communicative events engaged in by specific discourse communities whose members share broad communicative purposes (see Swales, 1990). This definition has led many ESP genre-focused researchers to closely associate genres with *discourse communities*, such as the various academic disciplines that students in graduate-level research writing classes are part of or will be part of. Genre researchers have also closely associated genre with the communicative purposes recognized by the discourse community because “the issue of writer purpose is essential to genre theory” (Johns, 2008, p. 239). The close attention to the purposes of a genre as recognized by its discourse community has also led ESP genre-focused scholars to use the nomenclature of these communities, such as the research article and grant proposal, to identify highly valued genres or part-genres, or the smaller parts within a genre, for scholars to analyze and for students to learn (Johns, 2003). The connections among a discourse community, its communicative purposes, and the rhetorical organizational and lexico-grammatical features in its valued genres often result in a “deeper and multilayered textual account” that strives to assess rhetorical purposes, unpack rhetorical structures, and identify syntactic and lexical choices in a discourse community’s valued genres, all with the needs and assumptions of the target discourse community in mind (Swales, 1990, p. 3). The emphasis on the connections among discourse community, communicative purposes, and organizational and lexico-grammatical features, thus, has great potential to help instructors and learners of graduate-level research writing to track “textual regularities and irregularities” and link them to “the relevant and pertinent social circumstances and the

rhetorical demands” in a coherent and systematic manner (Swales, 2009c, p. 14).

Additionally, the ESP approach to genre analysis offers a comparatively accessible analytical approach that teachers and learners of graduate-level research writing can adopt to engage in the “comparison and contrast” and “episodic dissection” of the target genres, which have the potential to lead to students’ heightened rhetorical consciousness (Swales, 2009c, p. 15). In fact, genre in the ESP tradition has been “widely recognized as conceptual and curricular building blocks of ‘the right size’” (Swales & Luebs, 2002, p. 136). More simply put, genre analysis involves, among other things, examining the genre’s rhetorical organization or schematic structure. The rhetorical organization is revealed by looking at the “moves”—a primarily functional, rather than formal, unit that performs a “bounded communicative act that is designed to achieve one main communicative objective” (Swales & Feak, 2000, p. 35). For example, a letter of admittance issued by the graduate school of a university would often include these moves: to acknowledge the relation between the writer and the letter receiver, to deliver the good news, to provide administrative details, and to close the letter in a welcoming tone that point to the future (see Swales & Feak, 2012a, for more details). In a research article abstract, there are likely these moves: to provide the background/introduction/situation to the project/paper, to present the research purpose, to explain the methods/materials/subjects/procedures, to provide the findings/results, and to offer discussions/conclusions/implications/recommendations (see Swales & Feak, 2009).

The analysis of the moves can then proceed to the linguistic (style, tone, voice, grammar, and syntax), or lexico-grammatical, features that help perform a particular rhetorical move or to bring it into its linguistic realization. For example, the lexico-grammatical features for delivering the good news of admittance would involve verbs such as *congratulate*, and closing a letter of admittance in a welcoming tone would include using phrases such as *look forward to*. In a similar vein, the “to



explain the methods” move in an abstract is often performed by verbs used in the past tense.

Although actual samples of a genre may vary in how they are perceived to be representative examples of the genre by members of the target discourse community, the often conventionalized rhetorical organizational and lexico-grammatical features give teachers and students something to identify and to discuss. Note that these conventionalized rhetorical organizational and lexico-grammatical patterns are recognized by members of the discourse community as helping to achieve the rhetorical purposes valued by that discourse community. Therefore, the analysis of rhetorical organizational and lexico-grammatical features should always be driven by one’s attention to the target discourse community and its sanctioned or valued communicative purposes. After all, “It is communicative purposes (defined in relation to a discourse community’s shared goals) that gives rise to and provides the rationale for a genre and shapes its internal structure,” as explained by Bawarshi and Reiff (2010, p. 46). At the same time, a deeper awareness of these patterns furthers one’s understanding of the discourse community and its communicative purposes, thus allowing instructors and students to see the constant interactions between the textual and the rhetorical situational aspects in research genres.

The analysis of a genre should, therefore, be driven by attention to the “prototypical ... conventions of the genre” and “an understanding of the genre’s intended purposes and an awareness of the dynamics of persuasion within a socio-rhetorical context” (Tardy, 2009, p. 21). The first part develops formal knowledge of the genre while the second builds rhetorical knowledge of the genre. Paying close attention to the interactions between the textual and the rhetorical aspects of genre and aiming for the simultaneous and coherent development of students’ formal and rhetorical knowledge can raise students’ rhetorical consciousness (see Cheng, 2011b, for how the attention to the textual and the contextual could become mutually enriching in students’ analysis of genre samples).

To recap, the ESP approach to genre analysis proceeds from a genre’s rhetorical organizational pattern to the lexico-grammatical features that help bring such a pattern into realization, all the while closely attending to the genre’s communicative purposes and the values and expectations of the discourse community that drive the genre’s rhetorical organizational pattern and the associated lexico-grammatical features. Attending to all three forms a circle of potentially meaningful and productive analysis and provides instructors and learners of graduate-level research writing with a comparatively accessible framework, or at least the starting point, for analyzing target genres.

However, the actual analysis may become more complicated and possibly messier than it has been described here, as noted by Paltridge (1994) and Pho (2008), who have questioned whether the relationship between the top-down analysis of the rhetorical organization and the bottom-up analysis of the lexico-grammatical features in a genre is as straightforward as believed by researchers. Nevertheless, there is evidence that this framework is an accessible entry way into the analysis of a research genre. By practicing applying the framework, students can increase the sophistication of their analysis and can then carry the framework beyond the classroom to continuously heighten their rhetorical awareness and learn new genre-specific features. This process will be explained in detail in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

Finally, the ESP approach to genre analysis has produced descriptions of many discipline-specific research genres and part-genres. Some are genres directly related to what learners of graduate-level research writing need—journal articles, research proposals, dissertations—as well as their inherent genre-specific rhetorical organizational and lexico-grammatical features. As discussed in Chapter 1, some of these analyses of genres have led to pedagogical materials targeting graduate-level research writing (e.g., Swales & Feak, 2012a) or can be adapted for these purposes. Chapter 3 takes a closer look at materials and Chapter 4 explores other pedagogical applications.

In sum, the three reasons that the ESP approach to genre analysis is particularly applicable to the graduate-level research writing classroom are: (1) the close connections between the textual or the formal on the one hand and the contextual or the rhetorical on the other in the ESP approach to genre; (2) the relatively accessible analytical framework that covers the rhetorical organization, the lexico-grammatical features that support the rhetorical organization, and the rhetorical contexts underpinning the two in an interactive and synergistic manner; and (3) the availability of pedagogy-relevant findings from genre analysis studies on research genres or part-genres that have been translated into materials development or pedagogical applications for in- and out-of-class genre analysis.

### **An Expanded Understanding of Rhetorical Consciousness-Raising: Raising Genre Awareness and the Awareness of Genres**

The wide acceptance of rhetorical consciousness-raising as a suitable instructional objective in the research writing classroom and the ways that genre and genre analysis, particularly in the ESP tradition, assist in raising students' rhetorical consciousness have been discussed. But how can rhetorical consciousness-raising be compatible with learners' need to learn discipline-specific features in research genres? Participants in graduate-level research writing classes or workshops are typically pursuing research degrees in a diverse array of disciplines but will each need to write up and even publish their current or future research in a way that meets the expectations of their respective fields (Belcher, 2012). And we know that working with a multidisciplinary mix of students in the same class can be a challenge for novice instructors (see Chapter 1). So, does raising students' rhetorical consciousness mean heightening their awareness of the target genre/genres covered in a course as a discipline-neutral, general model of research writing? Or does it also mean that instructors should make students aware of the disciplinary variations based on the disciplines

of course participants—such as looking at journal articles in chemistry as well as those in biology together with articles in a range of other disciplines represented in the same class? If the latter is the choice, then what would be the relevance of these tasks to students in that class who are not in chemistry, in biology, or in any discipline unrelated to them from which a particular genre sample has been selected for in-class analysis? For example, would a graduate student in chemistry find the in-class discussion of a biology paper irrelevant and vice versa? To what extent should an instructor focus on the consciousness-raising of any possible disciplinary variations in a particular target genre in question?

These questions are both challenging and pressing given the misgivings expressed by some researchers about the feasibility of learning about genre in writing classes in general and about addressing disciplinary specificity in instructional settings in particular. For example, Freedman (1994) questions whether or not genre—with its complex rhetorical considerations—could be taught successfully in the classroom to begin with, let alone the possibility of covering all the disciplinary variations within the same target genre (see responses to Freedman's argument in Devitt, 2004; Hyland, 2002; Johns, 2008).

Most students in graduate-level writing classes are already juggling schedules to fit the writing class into their schedules because they are often taking a full load of disciplinary courses and are likely working as a teaching or research assistant (see Basturkmen, 2010; L. Flowerdew, 2016; Freeman, 2016; Norris & Tardy, 2006; Swales & Lindemann, 2002). As Tierney (2016) points out, unless the courses for graduate students pay attention to “genres that are highly discipline specific in which students have not had adequate instruction,” graduate students “simply will not attend” them (p. 276).

For these and other reasons, raising students' rhetorical consciousness of not only the target genres as discipline-general models or frameworks of writing, but also emphasizing the disciplinary variations within each of these genres should be a goal in the research writing classroom if instructors strive to meet two important learning objectives. One of these instructional objectives is to help course participants improve their



awareness of genre analysis as a conceptual framework that can be repeatedly applied to any genre. Instructors can guide course participants to analyze multiple discipline-specific examples of a target genre. These analyses should lead to students' ultimate realization that the ability to consider "the audience for and the purpose of a particular text, and how best to communicate rhetorically in that instance" (Beaufort, 2004, p. 140) is something that they can do for any example of any genre in any discipline. The process of carefully analyzing these discipline-specific genre examples offers opportunities for students to see how genre analysis is a productive and generative framework focused on the socio-rhetorical contexts (i.e., the immediate contexts, the roles of readers and writers, the discourse communities, and the communicative purposes). It also directs attention to the rhetorical organization in the genre and the lexico-grammatical features that undergird that organization. It helps students develop their genre awareness.

A second learning objective is the flip side of the first. Becoming aware of, and proficient in, genre analysis as a heuristic or a conceptual framework (the first objective) becomes the means that serves the goal of deepening one's rhetorical perspectives on the concrete textual features in the genre-specific features in one's own discipline (the second objective). In this way, students learn to produce discipline-specific texts within and beyond the writing class. I call the second objective awareness of genres. Though I distinguish between these two learning objectives (Cheng, 2007b; 2011b), they are intended as always interconnected, perpetually interacting, and mutually enabling. One serves as the means to the other, and vice versa. Specifically, the first learning objective—the development of rhetorical and genre awareness—helps students to achieve the second—the awareness of the characteristics of concrete features in the research genres in one's field. In turn, being aware of, and learning to constantly update, one's knowledge of the distinctive details in the research genres in one's field (the second learning objective) furthers the goal of enriching one's rhetorical knowledge and reinforcing one's knowledge

of genre analysis as a conceptual, heuristic framework. The two goals form a mutually propelling cycle (developing genre awareness leads to developing awareness of genres, which leads to furthering one's genre awareness, which leads to further enhancing one's awareness of genres, etc.) with the two elements feeding into each other in an ever-evolving manner.

In the literature on academic writing instruction, distinctions between these two goals have been proposed. For example, Johns (2008) distinguishes between two basic goals for a course: *genre acquisition*, a goal that focuses on students' ability to "reproduce a text type, often from a template, that is organized, or 'staged' in a predictable way" (p. 238), and *genre awareness*, which can assist students in developing the rhetorical flexibility necessary for adapting their socio-cognitive genre knowledge to ever-evolving contexts. Johns argues that a carefully designed and scaffolded program that focuses on genre awareness, as opposed to genre acquisition, is ideal for novice students and for other students as well.

In my discussion of genre awareness and awareness of genres, the two are mutually supporting, and one is not necessarily more "ideal" than the other because neither can be achieved without the other. In addition, genre awareness, in my view, has a distinct conceptual aspect to it. In other words, genre awareness means cultivating learners' awareness of genre analysis as a conceptual framework that could be applied across multiple genres or across multiple discipline-specific examples of the same genre. By becoming familiar with genre analysis as a conceptual framework, learners develop the kind of "rhetorical flexibility necessary for adapting their socio-cognitive genre knowledge to ever evolving contexts" (Johns, 2008, p. 238). Finally, the awareness of genres in the framework proposed does not imply the kind of separation between the textual and the rhetorical. In other words, awareness of the concrete genre-specific features, as seen in the disciplinarily varied samples within the same genre, necessarily entails awareness of how these features have been affected by their rhetorical contexts. These distinctions become important when

we look at how genre awareness and awareness of genres, or the awareness of genre-specific features in discipline-specific writing, may play out in materials and concrete learning tasks.

### Questions for Reflection and Discussion

1. What does the word *rhetorical* mean in the term *rhetorical consciousness-raising*? Has your understanding of this word (*rhetorical*) changed in any way after you have read this chapter? If yes, how so? If no, why not? In your own words, explain to a novice instructor what *rhetorical consciousness-raising* means and what it typically entails.
2. Can you think of any additional reasons why rhetorical consciousness-raising is a suitable learning objective in the graduate-level writing classroom? Conversely, can you think of any reasons why rhetorical consciousness-raising may not be the most suitable goal to you? If so, what should be the suitable instructional objective in the graduate-level writing classroom, in your view?
3. This chapter introduces the concept of genre. To what extent has this chapter changed or updated your understanding of genre?
4. This chapter offers three reasons why I believe the ESP genre analytical framework is especially suitable for the graduate-level research classroom: (1) the close attention given by the ESP approach to both the textual and the contextual aspects of genre, (2) the comparatively accessible analytical framework practiced by those adopting the ESP approach, and (3) the rich pedagogy-relevant research findings on research genres generated by those adopting the ESP approach to genre analysis. Which one is especially appealing or convincing to you? Can you think of any additional reasons why the ESP approach to genre may be especially relevant for the graduate-level research writing classroom?

5. Explain to a novice instructor the differences between the concepts of *genre awareness* and *awareness of genres* as discussed in this chapter. You may want to consider this scenario to help your explanation: You are teaching a graduate-level writing class with students from multiple disciplines. Two of the students in this class are in chemistry, and the other eighteen students are from various disciplines unrelated to chemistry. If you analyze a sample from a journal article in chemistry in class, how would this activity help develop the genre awareness as well as the awareness of genres in the eighteen students in the same class who are from disciplines unrelated to chemistry? If you feel that you still cannot offer a perfectly clear explanation at this point, don't worry. After reading Chapters 3 and 4, try your explanation again to see if you can do a better job.