

Some parts of this thesis may have been removed for copyright restrictions.

If you have discovered material in AURA which is unlawful e.g. breaches copyright, (either yours or that of a third party) or any other law, including but not limited to those relating to patent, trademark, confidentiality, data protection, obscenity, defamation, libel, then please read our [Takedown Policy](#) and [contact the service](#) immediately

**REACTING AND RESPONDING IN *TESOL*
QUARTERLY: A GENERIC ANALYSIS OF
PROCEDURE AND PURPOSE IN
INTERTEXTUAL CRITICAL EXCHANGES**

CHRISTOPHER NICOL

Doctor of Philosophy

ASTON UNIVERSITY

May 2005

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognize that its copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the thesis and no information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Aston University

Reacting and responding in “TESOL Quarterly”: a generic analysis of procedure and purpose in intertextual critical exchanges.

Christopher Nicol
Doctor of Philosophy
2005

Summary

A key feature of ‘TESOL Quarterly’, a leading journal in the world of TESOL/applied linguistics, is its ‘Forum’ section which invites ‘responses and rebuttals’ from readers to any of its articles. These ‘responses or rebuttals’ form the focus of this research. In the interchanges between readers reacting to earlier research articles in *TESOL Quarterly* and authors responding to the said reaction I

- examine the texts for evidence of genre-driven structure, whether shared between both ‘reaction’ and ‘response’ sections, or peculiar to each section, and
- attempt to determine the precise nature of the intended communicative purpose in particular and the implications for academic debate in general.

The intended contribution of this thesis is to provide an analysis of how authors of research articles and their critics pursue their efforts beyond the research article which precipitated these exchanges in order to be recognized by their discourse community as, in the terminology of Swales (1981:51), ‘Primary Knowers’.

Awareness of any principled generic process identified in this thesis may be of significance to practitioners in the applied linguistics community in their quest to establish academic reputation and in their pursuit of professional development. These findings may also be of use in triggering productive community discussion as a result of the questions they raise concerning the present nature of academic debate.

Looking beyond the construction and status of the texts themselves, I inquire into the kind of ideational and social organization such exchanges keep in place and examine an alternative view of interaction.

This study breaks new ground in two major ways. To the best of my knowledge, it is the first exploration of a bipartite, intertextual structure laying claim to genre status. Secondly, in its recourse to the comments of the writers’ themselves rather than relying exclusively on the evidence of their texts, as is the case with most studies of genre, this thesis offers an expanded opportunity to discuss perhaps the most interesting aspect of genre analysis – the light it throws on social ends and the role of genre in determining the nature of current academic debate as it here emerges.

Keywords: genre analysis, intertextual critical exchanges, primary knower, displacive discourse

Acknowledgements

I owe my greatest debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Julian Edge. Without his infectious enthusiasm for all aspects of the analytic and synthetic process, this thesis might well have never reached fruition. His help in shaping the document was as tactfully offered as it was sharply insightful.

Thanks are also due to Vijay K. Bhatia for the immense trouble he took to answer in generous depth my various queries on genre. John Swales, John Sinclair, Angele Tadros, Susan Hunston and Sue Garton were also obligingly quick to answer my calls for information. To all of them I extend very warm thanks.

The TESOL Inc. archives were made freely available to me by Marilyn Kupetz and Helen Kornbloom and this assistance is most gratefully acknowledged.

To Warren White who supported this research in very material ways I also owe an immense debt of gratitude.

Contents

<u>Chapter 1</u>	<u>Introduction and Overview</u>	12
1.1.	<i>TESOL Quarterly</i> and ‘The Forum’	13
1.2.	Defining the contribution	13
1.3.	Breaking new ground	15
1.4.	Chapter overview	15
<u>Chapter 2</u>	<u>Intertextual critical exchanges: a generic background</u>	18
2.1.	Language use and the creation of knowledge	19
2.2.	Towards the contextualization of discourse	24
2.2.1.	The lexico-grammar contribution	25
2.2.2.	Beyond sentence boundaries	28
2.2.3.	Contextualizing discourse	30
2.3.	The usefulness of nomenclature	35
2.4.	Relating the ICE to the RA	36
<u>Chapter 3</u>	<u>Shaping opinion: orthodoxy, variation and variants</u>	38
3.1.	The RA and ICE: two perspectives on opinion shaping	39
3.1.1.	Ascendancy and the Primary Knower	40
3.2.	Shaping by pattern not prescription	42

<u>Chapter 4 Towards an analytical framework</u>	44
4.1. CDA and the ICE	44
4.2. The case for corpus linguistics	47
4.3. Evaluation as a frame for analysis	51
4.4. If genre, which school?	57
4.5. The moves and steps perspective	59
 <u>Chapter 5 Methodology</u>	 63
5.1. The corpus	64
5.2. Selection criteria	64
5.3. The selected texts	65
5.4. Consulting the writers	66
5.5. Checking findings	67
 <u>Chapter 6 Analysing the texts: opening moves</u>	 68
6.1. Entry moves in RR and AR texts	68
6.2. Move 1 Acknowledging contribution positively	69
6.2.1. An interesting case of negative politeness strategy	74
6.2.2. Alternative versions of Move 1	76
6.2.3. Symmetry of politeness acknowledgements	77
6.2.4. Move 1 postscript	78
6.3. Move 2 Overviewing trigger text content	79
6.3.1. Step 1 Creating quotation-rich reviews	79

6.3.2. Step 2 Creating abridged paraphrases	85
6.3.3. Move 2 postscript	88
6.4. Move 3 Priming reply	90
6.4.1. Step 1A Signalling generalized dissent (with concession)	91
6.4.2. Step 1B Signalling generalized dissent (without concession)	92
6.4.3. Step 2 Signalling particularized dissent (with concession)	94
6.4.4. Step 3 Signalling direction	97
6.4.5. Move 3 postscript	98
6.5. Move 4 Establishing authority	99
6.5.1. Step 1 Reviewing literature	100
6.5.2. Step 2 Reporting field experience	107
6.5.3. Step 3 Cultivating reader complicity	111
6.5.4. Move 4 Postscript	116
6.6. Move and step selection behaviour of RR and AR texts	117
 <u>Chapter 7 Analysing the texts: cognitive processing and its role in the intertextual critical exchange</u>	 119
 7.1. Reader Reaction: displacing the author	 120
7.2. Characterizing displacement	121
7.3. Triads and their origin	121
7.4. Unpacking a displacement triad	122
7.5. Identification	124

7.6. 3 types of negation	125
7.6.1. Type 1: non-concessive negation	125
7.6.2. Type 2: concessive negation	126
7.6.3. Type 3: combination negation	128
7.7. Replacement	131
7.7.1. Factual counterclaiming	131
7.7.2. The bi-partite Replacement	133
7.7.3. Ideational counterclaiming	134
7.7.4. Citing notional misunderstanding	137
7.7.5. Notional misunderstanding: a variation	141
7.7.6. Citing contentious claim	142
7.7.7. Citing imperfect methodology	144
7.7.8. Citing article deficiency	145
7.8. Postscript to Author displacement by Readers	146
7.9. Confronting displacement: the Author's Response	149
7.9.1. Triads revisited	150
7.10. Highlighting variation between RR and AR displacements	151
7.10.1. Replacement revisited: primary action	151
7.10.2. Secondary action in the Replacement turn: Readers	156
7.10.3. Secondary action in the Replacement turn: Authors	157
7.11. Downplaying the negative?	160
7.12. Article referrals	166
7.13. Rhetorical resonance	167

7.14. The Reader, the Author and displacive intentions	170
7.15. Cognitive processing or cognitive structuring?	173
7.15.1. Lauren Bacall and the displacement triad	175
 <u>Chapter 8 Analysing the texts: Closing the discussion</u>	178
8.1. Reacting Reader exit strategy	179
8.1.1. Exit moves	180
8.2. Move 1A Reaffirming concessively Primary Knower status	181
8.3. Move 1B Reaffirming non-concessively primary Knower status	185
8.3.1. Step 1 Making recommendations	186
8.3.2. Step 2 Reaffirming belief	190
8.3.3. Step 3 Summative counterclaiming	192
8.3.4. Postscript to Readers' exit strategy	193
8.4. Authors and their exit strategies	195
8.4.1. Move selection pattern	195
8.5. Move 1A Reaffirming concessively Primary Knower status	196
8.6. Move 1B Reaffirming non-concessively Primary Knower status	197
8.6.1. Step 1 Refining motivating intentions	197
8.6.2. Step 2 Reaffirming belief	199
8.6.3. Step 3 Addressing the way ahead	200
8.6.4. Discrepant texts	203
8.6.5. Postscript to Readers' and Authors exit strategies	205
8.7. Summary of Readers' and Authors' exit strategies	207

<u>Chapter 9</u>	<u>Evaluating text status</u>	208
9.1.	Exploring generic integrity	209
9.2.	Genre or sub-genre?	213
9.3.	The bi-partite factor	218
<u>Chapter 10</u>	<u>Checking generic findings</u>	222
10.1	Opening moves in Atkinson/Kubota ICE	223
10.2	Core section behaviour	232
10.3	Closing the discussion	238
10.4	Postscript to Atkinson/Kubota ICE	240
<u>Chapter 11</u>	<u>Consulting the writers</u>	243
11.1	Genre awareness	244
11.2	Setting the record straight	246
11.3	The feeling factor	249
11.4	The odd couple	251
11.5	Reviewing behaviour	253
11.6	The consultation evaluated	254
<u>Chapter 12</u>	<u>Academic debate or programmed contentiousness?</u>	256
12.1.	The ICE: the socio-historic context	256
12.2.	The ICE: the systemic context	259

12.3. Counting the cost	262
12.4. Finding alternative ways	264
12.5. Enlarging the forum	270
12.6. The <i>polis</i> enfranchised, the community empowered	274

<u>References</u>	277
--------------------------	-----

Appendices

Appendix A Readers' and Authors' Displacement Triads	289
Appendix B Kubota/Atkinson ICE text	308
Appendix C Contact document to Readers and Authors	322

List of Tables

Table 1 Swales' CARS model of article introductions	60
Table 2 Reference frequency by Readers and Authors	106
Table 3 Entry strategy of Readers and Authors	117
Table 4 Reader behaviour	118
Table 5 Author behaviour	118
Table 6 Primary action in Readers' Replacements	147
Table 7 Categorization of Readers' Replacements	147
Table 8 Primary action in RR/AR Replacements	153
Table 9 Categorization of RR/AR Replacements	154
Table 10 Secondary action in Readers' Replacements	156

Table 11	Secondary action in RR/AR Replacements	158
Table 12	Termination signalling behaviour	178
Table 13	Reacting Reader exit pattern	181
Table 14	Reacting Reader Exit Move 1A	183
Table 15	Reacting Reader Exit Move 1B	186
Table 16	Responding Author exit pattern	195
Table 17	Responding Author Exit Move 1B	197
Table 18	Summary of exit strategies by Readers and Authors	207
Table 19	Comparison of Reader/Author exchange comments	252

1. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Given the rhetorical formality associated with research articles in today's academic world, a formality encouraged over two decades in no small way by research-process writing studies from figures such as Swales (1981, 1985, 1990); Bhatia (1993, 1997); Bazerman (1988); Holmes (1997); Nwogu (1997); Dudley-Evans (1994, 1986); Hopkins and Dudley-Evans (1988); Crookes (1986); Huckin (1987); Bley-Vroman and Selinker (1984); Lopez (1982); Jacoby (1987); Cooper (1985); Stanley (1984); Bruce (1983); Zappen (1983); Samraj (2002); Peacock (2002) among others, it is perhaps easy to overlook the fact that the earliest examples of research writing in the first scientific periodical, *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, (founded 1665) had the stylistic informality (and, indeed, salutation patterns) of a letter exchange between two scientists working in a common field. (Ard 1983). The very act of publishing these letters, however, subtly altered their status from a strictly two-way exchange to a two-way exchange intended to be read and interpreted by a third participant, the scientific discourse community of the age. The earliest notion of a published academic forum had been launched.

Nearly four hundred years later, with research articles largely rhetorically formalized, the idea of an academic arena of published exchanges still enjoys favour. The continuation of this tradition has a particular resonance here, for this thesis sets out to examine the communicative intentions and generic structures of just such a seemingly bipartite discussion with tripartite implications. The arena this time, however, is a modern one.

1.1. 'TESOL Quarterly' and 'The Forum'.

Founded in 1967, 'TESOL Quarterly' has become one of the most prestigious journals in the world of applied linguistics. Its 'The Forum' section, which began in embryonic form in 1973, has evolved into an established, if irregular, feature of the publication, one whose rubric at the time of writing reads:

TESOL Quarterly invites commentary on current trends or practices in the TESOL profession. It also welcomes responses or rebuttals to any articles or remarks published here in The Forum or elsewhere in the *Quarterly*. (Vol. 36, No.2, 2002)

It is the solicited 'responses or rebuttals' which form the focus of the present research. In the interchanges between readers reacting to earlier research articles and commentaries in *TESOL Quarterly* and authors responding to the said reaction we shall

- examine the texts for evidence of genre-driven structure, whether shared between both 'reaction' and 'response' sections, or peculiar to each section, and
- attempt to determine the precise nature of the intended communicative purpose in particular and the implications for academic debate in general.

1.2. Defining the contribution

While language here is our point of departure, we should not lose sight of Bhatia's (2002) perception that successful sociorhetorical manipulation is a means of

empowerment to achieve discourse community consensus. This, I hope to demonstrate, is a key element of the intentions at work in the texts under analysis.

The contribution of this thesis will be to provide an analysis of how authors of research articles and their critics pursue their efforts beyond the original article which precipitated these exchanges to be recognized by their discourse community as 'Primary Knowers', a term used by Swales (1981), Tadros (1981) and Berry (1981) and to which we shall return frequently in the following chapters. (For discussion of term see 3.1.1.) The Reacting Readers and Responding Authors - to adopt the *TESOL Quarterly* nomenclature for the participants - do so in a textualisation process which like the research article itself derives authority from current disciplinary consensus and new knowledge claims. They seek to win consensus and, indeed, ascendancy by generic action which manifests clearly identifiable structural preferences but which also negotiates its status in textualisation processes as rich in variation as the personalities of the writers in question.

Awareness of the principled generic process identified in this thesis may be of significance to practitioners in the applied linguistics community in their quest to establish academic reputation and in their pursuit of professional development. These findings may also be of use in triggering productive community discussion as a result of the questions they raise concerning the present nature of academic debate as manifested in these exchanges. For emerging from these intertextual critical exchanges must surely be the question of whether such generically typified exchanges truly optimize the opportunities for the advancement of academic enquiry.

1.3. Breaking new ground

While studies in genre analysis enjoy a growing vogue, this study breaks new ground in two major ways. To the best of my knowledge, it is the first exploration of a bipartite, intertextual structure laying claim to genre status. As such it poses intricately complex problems in arranging analysis coherently, there being a regular need to relate one text to another to determine if sufficient prototypicality exists to sustain generic claims for the total bipartite entity. Secondly, in its recourse to the comments of the writers themselves rather than relying exclusively on the evidence of their texts, as is the case with most studies of genre, this thesis offers an expanded opportunity to discuss perhaps the most interesting aspect of genre analysis – the light it throws on social ends (Miller 1984) and the role of genre in determining the nature of current academic debate as it here emerges.

1.4. Chapter overview

Chapter 1 Here are laid out the broad aims of the research into the intertextual critical exchanges to be found in the “Forum” section of *TESOL Quarterly*. The chapter also indicates how textual analysis will be enriched by comments the ‘Forum’ contributors themselves, marking out this approach from previous genre analysis research, before briefly indicating the content of subsequent chapters.

Chapter 2 This chapter names the heretofore un-named exchange of views between Reacting Readers and Responding Authors as an ‘intertextual critical exchange’, a term more fully discussed in 2.3.. It also seeks to contextualize the intertextual critical exchange in relation to the research article itself, from which it draws its existence,

but also sets it against the wider canvas of the development of discourse- and genre-studies in the latter half of the twentieth century.

Chapter 3 Since the aim of the intertextual critical exchange is to establish discourse community consensus, this chapter raises the question of how ‘credible writer ethos’ is achieved in the research process writing, indicating convergences and differences of the intertextual critical exchange with the research article itself and emphasizing the probabilistic rather than prescriptive nature of the patterns involved in generic manipulation. The term “Primary Knower”, its provenance and its significance to the study are examined.

Chapter 4 This chapter reflects on the process involved in arriving at an analysis framework for glossing the texts comprehensively and why a socio-cognitive Swalesian approach was preferred to three other possible models.

Chapter 5 Here are given details of the research methodology followed, the corpus examined, the selection process applied, the contributors named and a brief explanation of why the contributors were approached for their own comments on their texts.

Chapters 6, 7 and 8. These three chapters are devoted to the detailed analysis of the 30 *TESOL Quarterly* texts which make up the data-base. Respectively, they deal with the entry strategies for launching the texts, the debating manoeuvres of writers in the central sections of the texts and, finally, the preferred exit strategies of Readers and Authors.

Chapter 9. Here the aim is to determine if, and to what extent, the findings equate with current definitions of generic integrity and to examine how generic integrity is itself currently defined. The chapter seeks also to situate the status of the intertextual critical exchange (ICE) in the larger family of other research-process genres.

Chapter 10. A pattern of generic behaviour having been established in the four previous chapters, the aim in Chapter 10 is to check the findings against a randomly chosen ICE from a later issue of *TESOL Quarterly* as a form of external validation of the conclusions drawn from the larger study.

Chapter 11. This chapter triangulates the inquiry process in that the Readers and Authors involved give their perspectives on some of the major issues raised by this research.

Chapter 12. Here the implications of the inquiry's findings for "forum"-type debate as currently practised is examined. The chapter looks at alternative approaches to constructive academic dialogue and makes suggestions as to how this might be achieved.

2. INTERTEXTUAL CRITICAL EXCHANGES: A GENERIC BACKGROUND

The fact that we have already used the term 'genre' or 'generic' several times in the space of a few pages suggests that it might be useful to look more closely at what we mean by it.

Over the last 20 years during which genre analysis has pursued the quest for a thicker description of language to aid nonnative and native speakers alike in their efforts to integrate specific discourse communities, there has been no shortage of definitions of the term itself. Bhatia (2002 : 22) usefully collates several of them:

Genre Analysis is the study of situated linguistic behaviour in institutionalized academic or professional settings, whether in terms of *typification of rhetorical action* as in Miller (1984), and Berkentotter and Huckin (1995); *regularities of staged, goal oriented social processes*, as in Martin, Christie and Rothery (1987) and Martin (1993); or *consistency of communicative purposes*, as in Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993).

But while these descriptions are helpful in explaining how genre is defined and recognized by the discourse analysis community, they do not really suggest what it is that genre actually does.

One answer which in its pragmatism has coloured much of my own thinking throughout this document is offered by Miller (1984:151) who, from her rhetorician's perspective, is quite clear that :

..a rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centred not on the substance or form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish.

For Miller genre is primarily about ends and once we have decided on the ends which we may have, we organize the surface language structures in what we believe is the best way to achieve these social ends.

The idea of genre as a means of social action is taken up again by Swales from another perspective, that of text analysis for use in academic and research settings (1990:46):

..genres are communicative vehicles for the achievement of goals.

This is a point which must not be lost sight of in a study which spends several chapters analyzing linguistic behaviour in text organisation. It must be remembered that this textual analysis is not an end in itself but a necessary process in determining the social and professional goals being targeted.

2.1. Language use and the creation of knowledge.

In the section which follows this one, I shall survey some of the studies that have made a contribution to exploring the textual/socio-professional relationships referred to above. But first, it is perhaps useful to try to understand a few central developments both in language use and knowledge creation in the second half of the twentieth century, developments which have helped shape our current conception of genre and which underpin its usefulness in socio-professional discourse.

Writers on the origins of present-day genre-studies (Bhatia 2004; Swales 1990; Freedman and Medway 1994) are careful to emphasize the eclectic nature of the influences that guided genre development. In this section, I survey some of the

main background influences which have conditioned our understanding of the unfolding story of genre's role in our lives and workplaces.

One of the most substantial of those influences stemmed from the growing interest accorded to rhetoric in the understanding of human action as the twentieth century advanced. Far from being merely an appurtenance of the oratorical traditions of the older universities, rhetoric was, in fact, found to be informing writing practices in important ways. In 1950 came Burke's pioneering work, 'A Rhetoric of Motives', and in 1969 Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's 'The New Rhetoric', both underlining in their different ways the essentially persuasive nature of research writing in areas not traditionally associated with *suasive* textualization. Burke (1950:45) discusses 'language's symbolic action' being 'exercised about the necessary *suasive* nature of even the most unemotional scientific nomenclatures'. In the intervening years Kuhn (1962), as a prominent scientist and philosopher of science, added substantially to the idea that even in the pure sciences, long associated in the minds of most with unemotional, non-*suasive* language, theories were established rhetorically and communally (Beyer 1988). This work on rhetoric helped pave the way for later studies in genre, for the two fields, other differences notwithstanding, share a common *suasive* mission. As Coe (1994:182) phrases it:

If rhetoric is the study of verbal persuasion, then the rhetoric of genre is the study of how generic structures influence (i.e. 'persuade') both writers and readers.

How scientists construct knowledge in their fields has led to a steady stream of scientific rhetoric studies (Widdowson 1973; Latour and Woolgar 1979; Mulkay 1979; Knorr-Cetina 1981; Gross 1990). No student of socio-rhetorical studies in other

socio-professional contexts can overestimate the contribution of scientists to what was once thought of as a 'literary' field in spreading the notion of a systematic basis for constructing textual strategies to present and have accepted new knowledge claims. In so doing, they contributed significantly to the earliest developments of what was much later labelled genre studies.

Throughout the 1980s, advancing in parallel with these rhetorical realizations of how information was shaped, were ideas affecting even more profoundly the basis of how knowledge was constructed. While rhetoric studies helped determine how suasive behaviour affected text, social constructivism (and the closely allied constructionism), imported largely from philosophy, suggested entirely new ways in making sense of our lives and the world around us. Rorty (1979) believed that any attempt to make sense of our lives by viewing ourselves and our behaviour in relation to belief in some externally-imposed set of 'foundational' values deriving from religion, science or philosophy was doomed, in that these, in many instances, have been shown to be constructs that are evanescent, illusory or unverifiable in themselves. Bruffee (1986), adapting Rorty's work to composition studies, argued that knowledge was not absolutely but merely socially and temporarily constructed :

.....there is only agreement, a consensus arrived at for the time being by communities of knowledgeable peers. Concepts, ideas, theories, the world, reality, and facts are all language constructs generated by knowledge communities and used by them to maintain community coherence. (p.777)

Or, as Richards (2003:39) describes constructivism:

This is a view holding firmly to the position that knowledge and truth are created rather than discovered and that reality is pluralistic. Constructivists seek to understand not the essence of a real world but the richness of a world that is socially determined.

This new power accorded to the 'socially determined' had important implications for writing and writers of research. If there was to be, in Bruffee's words, a community of 'knowledgeable peers', one that created its own socially-determined knowledge and truth, then, to ensure internal cohesion and comprehensibility, it was clear that it needed to develop a community-shared, community-recognized socio-cultural/socio-rhetorical approach to the creation of its discourse. Such a need, as Freedman and Medway (1994:5) point out, helped drive forward genre studies:

These emphases on the community and the socio-cultural, the acknowledgement and indeed the celebration of the shaping power of the social, provide some of the groundwork on which social and contextual redefinitions of genre are based.

It was in the writings of the 'relativist', 'social perspectivists' or 'social constructionist' thinkers that one very important aspect of this 'groundwork' emerged – the adoption of the term 'discourse community'. Swales traces its usage back to Faigley (1986), although it is Herzberg's analysis of its contribution that is more often cited:

Use of the term 'discourse community' testifies to the increasingly common assumption that discourse operates within conventions defined by communities, be they academic disciplines or social groups. The pedagogies associated with writing across the curriculum and academic English now use the notion of 'discourse communities' to signify a cluster of ideas: that language use in a group is a form of social behavior, that discourse is a means of maintaining and extending the group's knowledge and of initiating new members into the group, and that discourse is epistemic or constitutive of the group's knowledge. (1986:1)

And, as Swales (1990:26) reminds us, discourse communities develop 'discoursal expectations' as regards

..the appropriacy of topics, the form, function and positioning of discoursal elements, and the role texts play in the operation of the discourse community.

In other words, social constructivism as a means to understanding the world has had profound implications not just for how *knowledge* is constructed but for how *texts* are constructed and how they are used in their discourse community. For with questions being raised about ‘the form, functioning and positioning of discursal elements’ and ‘the role texts play in the operation of the discourse community’, we are entering fairly and squarely the world of mainstream genre-study research.

Another shaping influence on genre studies in the second half of the twentieth century was speech act theory as articulated by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). It must be said right away that, although neither man worked directly on the analysis of texts, much later work on genre analysis is predicated on their ideas. By underlining the fact that words do much more than make statements about the world and depend on context for their intended meaning to be made fully clear, they help us account for certain aspects of writerly activity observed in genre-driven texts. For example, in the intertextual critical exchanges which form the substance of the research here, the forum text is offered ostensibly as a contribution to the field, but experienced practitioners may see other motives at work here when one professional engages in a public debate with another. For younger members of the profession engaging with a more established figure, it may constitute an attempt to gain reputation or tenure; for others it may be the retort to a perceived professional/personal slight (acknowledged overtly by one participant in the research); for most, it appears to be a jockeying for discursive ascendancy, linguistic/professional issues notwithstanding.

The above illustrations are useful for making a second point about how speech act theory has implications for genre studies. For if we accept that there are real-world goals targeted beyond the surface meaning of the words, then we are beginning to understand a fundamental truth about genre: that discourse is action, or, as Martin (1985:250) puts it

...genres are how things get done, when language is used to accomplish them.

Which brings us back to the comments of Miller and Swales cited in the opening paragraphs of this chapter and their shared belief that genres exist primarily to achieve goals and that any definition of them must centre itself on the action they are used to accomplish.

2.2. Towards the contextualization of discourse

In 2.1. we looked at the linguistic backdrop against which the story of genre-studies was unfolding in the second half of the twentieth century. How that story developed to take us from discussions of registers (Barber 1962, Halliday, McIntosh and Stevens 1964) to the analysis of the intertextual critical exchanges here today forms the substance of this section. I survey a number of studies and demonstrate the contribution they have made.

Standing back from the development of genre-studies, we can see at least three evolving phases in the analysis of discourse. It is difficult, however, to talk of these phases as if they occurred in some neat sequential pattern. While the phases outlined below do follow a very rough diachronic path, there is considerable overlap,

reflecting both the range and the diversity of linguistic inquiry over the last five decades. The main preoccupations of these various phases can perhaps be usefully looked under the following rubrics:

- The lexico-grammar contribution
- Beyond sentence boundaries
- Contextualizing discourse

2.2.1. The lexico-grammar contribution

In the first of these three phases, one of the most influential studies was one already referred to: Halliday, McIntosh and Stevens (1964). It, like several others of the period, concentrated analysis on the distributional frequency of discrete-item features in certain academic and professional discursive settings. In such studies, the word *register* is frequently evoked. This has been described by Gregory and Carroll (1978:4) as

...a contextual category correlating groupings of linguistic features with recurrent situational features..

Some of the contextual categories and recurrent situational/linguistic features investigated at the time involved tenses in the rhetoric of science (Barber 1962) and, in the world of legal discourse, binomials and multinomials (Gustaffsson 1975) and noun-verb combinations (Spencer 1975).

This unpacking of language choices by writers in certain spheres obviously helped characterize community-specific texts in a way that foreshadowed later, more situation-specific studies, but even in its own terms, of course, such a frequency-based approach was hampered by the absence of computer technology now available. Another weakness was pointed out by Widdowson (1979:55-6):

The fact that scientific English exhibits a relatively high proportion of certain syntactic features and a relatively low proportion of others may be useful for identifying scientific English texts should we ever wish to do such a thing. But it cannot reveal the communicative character of what was written.

Studies looking a little beyond register labels and revealing more about the communicative character were beginning to make their appearance, however. Scholars were beginning to note that even if a medical research article shared the same register as a medical journal editorial, it did not mean that they both shared a common communicative purpose (Adams Smith 1984). In the world of legal discourse, it was observed (Bhatia 1983) that a shared register was all that was shared by legislative prose, legal textbooks and legal case reports. Each one of the three was different in its communicative intentions which had implications for addresser-addressee relationships in particular and its textualization conventions in general.

Interest in the contribution of communicative intentions was leading to what Swales (1990:3) calls a 'narrower and deeper' approach to investigating textual behaviour. It was not enough to examine texts for the distributional frequency of certain surface features and their stylistic appropriacy. Now attention was moving to the communicative implications for making certain choices of discrete items in certain specific contexts. Tarone et al. (1981) looked at how the choice between *we* +

active verb and its passive alternative affected communicative outcomes in two papers on astrophysics. It was noticed that certain linguistic features distinguished certain sections of research articles from others, because the writer's communicative intentions varied from section to section. At one point s/he might wish to describe, at another to argue, leading to distinctive language usage in the various sections. (Heslot 1982; Hopkins and Dudley Evans 1988).

Illustrating usefully this 'deepening' process that was taking place in functional values in localized areas of text was a series of studies into how tense and aspect usage of verbs were employed in research articles to refer to previous research. (Lackstrom et al. 1972; Swales 1981; Oster 1981; Ard 1982, 1985; Een 1982; Trimble and Trimble 1982; Malcolm 1987). Swales' well-documented study of the use of attributive 'en'-participles in single-noun NPs in chemistry text-books (1974) joins such studies in revealing the direction that interest in communicative effectiveness was taking research into language usage. Bhatia (2004:5) is quick to point out, however, that such investigations into functional values of lexicogrammatical features in specialized texts were often taking place within clause boundaries and, as yet, 'without much reference to discourse organization'.

Given, however, that the operations of decision and selection were increasingly under examination by text-analysts, it was perhaps inevitable that they would eventually widen their focus to inquire what decisions and selection procedures went on in a writer's mind to assemble the properties of less localized, more global textual structures.

2.2.2. Beyond sentence boundaries

While noting Bhatia's comment above that localized functional values were being examined 'without much reference to discourse organization' (2004:5) it would be inaccurate to deny that there was nascent interest in looking at the conceptualization of text beyond clause boundaries through semantics and pragmatics, as evidenced by the work of van Dijk (1977, 1985), Brown and Yule (1983) and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981).

Knowledge, Coulthard reminds us, is not linear, but text is (1994:7). In the following section we shall be looking at some of the ways scholars attempted to deal with the issue of linearity.

The fact that textual organization rather than discrete-item distribution or localized functional values appears to be attracting more and more the attention of researchers at this period has profound effects on the way later studies will develop. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:33) well illustrate this developing dynamic :

...we are concerned with the operations which manipulate units and patterns during the utilization of language systems in application. The TEXT [sic] figures as the actual outcome of these operations.

While the communicative implications of certain textual manipulations and patterning were becoming more noticed,

All of these aspects of discourse organization, however, were applicable to discourse in general rather than to specific genres. (Bhatia 2004:8)

Nevertheless, despite Bhatia's caveat, the global structure of text was being usefully scrutinized for clues to the properties of its composition. Attention was being

given to the connectivity that cohesion and coherence could bring to the larger textual structure. (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Hoey 1983,1991; Tadros 1981; Francis 1986) These organizational structures enjoyed various names. For van Dijk (1985) they were macrostructures; for de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) schematic structures; for Brown and Yule (1983) information structures. This latter term encompasses also work by Hoey (1983) and Winter (1986, 1994) to whom we shall return later in this thesis for explanations of text-construction behaviour identified in the research corpus. Other studies attempting to trace the regularities of organization in discourse include that of Tadros (1985) who witnesses how 'predictive structures' shaped text and that of Crombie (1985) whose Topic-Restriction-Illustration pattern also accounts for macro-structuring in text. Coulthard (1977) looked to other disciplines, such as conversational analysis, to seek to explain the unifying constituents of discourse, both written and spoken.

In their different ways, many of these scholars were interested more in how writers (and speakers) handled the process of discourse construction rather than how specific professional/work-place contexts might influence that construction. Studies which focused more on the context-specificity of texts, studies which illuminated the variations that the different social ends of practitioners could impose on their texts, studies which described the ways that practitioners went about achieving their specific work-place goals, - these were already ongoing, but in another part of the wood.

2.2.3. Contextualizing discourse.

The year 1981, which saw the publication of the pioneering work of de Beaugrande and Dressler on the linguistics of text, saw an equally pioneering work on the linguistics of *context* – Swales' influential 'Aspects of article introductions'. Cognitive models of the writing process had been offered before, as we read above, but done in such a way as to draw Bhatia's comment that they were only 'applicable to discourse in general' (2004:8). But here Swales was offering a descriptive discourse model based on text analysis that was *socially-situated*. 48 articles from the 'hard sciences' (Molecular Physics, Solid State Physics, Electronics, Chemical Engineering), the biology/medical field and the social sciences were analyzed and the outcomes eventually emerged as Swales CARS (Creating a Research Space) model of 1990. But this was no mere textual analysis:

Since genre study is commonly identified with the analysis of texts, it would be useful, at an early juncture, to clarify that I propose to view genres as rather more than texts. While it remains necessary to use texts in order to understand how texts organize themselves informationally, rhetorically and stylistically, textual knowledge remains generally insufficient for a full account of genre. (1990:6)

Looking beyond text for a 'full account of genre' led Swales to ethnomethodology.

It therefore seems to me that the ethnomethodological approach with its emphasis on 'the practical reasoning contained within types of human activity' offers a way of viewing introductions as being subject to their own conventionalized communicative laws rather than belonging to a possibly fictional universe of discourse governed by objectivity and reason (1981:86)

In other words, this approach combined not just what was said but also how and why it was said, as Swales himself is quoted as saying elsewhere in this document. He talks in this context of 'the surfaces and shadows' (1981: 87) of text, the surfaces being that part of the analysis that answers questions of textual description, the shadows those of that background presence that hovers over human motivation in textual activity.

But as well as investigating the human role in texts, he and others in this sphere of text/context inquiry (Doheny-Farina, 1986; Bazerman 1988; Schryer 1994; Van Nostrand 1994; Miller and Selzer 1985; Winsor 1989; Barabas 1990; Cross 1993; Pare 1993; Smart 1993) were keen to examine the roles that texts play in their social environments. While Swales asks what role the textbook plays in lecture courses (is it a bible of reference or a repository of sometimes suspect information?), Bazerman considers how the system of genres connected with the establishment of patents have their own 'illocutionary force' (1994:91) to work towards their commercial ends. How these texts affect functioning in the work-place is as much a preoccupation as the texts themselves.

This is nowhere better illustrated than in Schryer (1994) who studied the professional tensions created in a veterinary school by the research-practice divide and exacerbated by the competing genres of the researchers' IMRDS format (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion and Summary) (Bruce 1983) and that of the clinicians' POVMR (Problem Oriented Veterinary Medical Record). Not only did this research-practice divide create inter-school tensions, with the IMRDS enjoying

the higher status, but the POVMR the higher popularity with students bound for veterinary practice, but it also impinged on the quality of the professional education process on offer:

I observed graduate students from both the biomedical and clinical areas presenting their research in progress at grand rounds. Those trained in IMRDS's tradition not only used the IMRDS structure but also connected their research to wider interests in their disciplines. Graduate students in the clinical areas had a harder time. They usually presented in the POVMR format, and rarely connected their cases either to other cases or to wider research interests. As a result they were often critiqued, even by clinicians. Their research was seen as unsubstantial and invalid. (1994:121)

Schryer, as the language expert consulted, opines:

In my view, the consequences of this division between research and practice, a division partially held in place by competing genres are serious for professions like veterinary medicine... In my view, the very socializing genres at the college were working to maintain this division. (1994:121)

Her solution – to integrate elements of each reporting format into the other – is perhaps less important than the central truth it points to, that of the significant power of genre to influence social situations and issues well beyond matters of textual organization.

The power of genres in the very different field of R&D in America's Department of Defense occupies the attention of Van Nostrand (1994). Examining the prolonged exchange of tendering documents between the DoD and the various vendors of research, he concludes that the establishing of the precise technical requirements (often related to other ongoing, related research projects) which goes into the procurement process in itself frequently 'generates knowledge' (1994:136).

The documents exchanged by customer and vendor refine the objectives, budget and duration of the project by iterating the activities that will comprise it. These iterations progressively shape the project and define the deliverable knowledge products that the project is intended to generate. (1994:135)

This defining task, conducted by the discourse exchange system of customer/vendor genres, 'over such long periods of time, lasting many months and sometimes several years' (p.136) revealed that

...many components of a knowledge structure have already been established before a contract has been signed. Such components include the values to be quantified (by curves or numbers), the conditions of the tests that will yield those quantitative values, the rationale for such tests and the means of assessing them, and even the parameters of expected results. These components of a knowledge structure will have been established before the project formally begins.

Here, once again, we witness the social power of generic documents to influence workplace outcomes.

The most recent work on genre underlines the fact that workplace outcomes continue to influence studies as much as textual regularities. Vergaro (2002) examines how CBT (computer-based training) assisted Italian students to define and attain success in money-chasing letters consonant with business discourse practice in the anglo-saxon world. Similarly, dos Santos (2002), adopting the Swalesian Moves and Steps model, examined commercial letters exchanged by fax between a Brazilian company and two European ones to optimize results from business letters of negotiation and to influence business English teaching practices.

Academia, too, continues to pursue a 'narrower and deeper' (Swales 1990:3) description of generic practice in its own texts, as the most recent of genre studies testify. The already extensive work over the last two decades on the research article notwithstanding (see Chapter 1), Peacock (2002) writes of the discussion section of a corpus of 256 research articles over seven disciplines being examined in a bid to improve NNSs' grasp of research writing. Samraj (2002) follows in this inter-

disciplinary tradition by looking again at the CARS model of introductions for articles from the related fields of Conservation Biology and Wildlife Behaviour, noting how Conservation Biology favoured reporting outcomes in terms of real world considerations rather than the epistemic world of research and proposes that a greater degree of embedding is needed in the CARS model to account for the structures analyzed. The most recent study of all to be considered here, Hyon and Chen (2004), seeks to help acculturate NNSs students and to improve faculty performance by looking beyond the research article to other university genres found in teaching and administration through a study of faculty writing.

This has been necessarily only a small sample of the work that has been carried out but it suffices to demonstrate the direction that the contextualization of discourse has taken over the past decades.

Writing as far back as 1994, Pare and Smart (p.146) sum up neatly the predominating dynamic of genre studies today:

Until recently, the study of written genres focused on textual patterns. When researchers wanted to examine a particular genre, they looked across multiple texts for regularities of form and effect. Over the last decade, scholars in composition studies have been reinterpreting genre as social action: a complex pattern of repeated social activity and rhetorical performance arising in response to a recurrent situation.

It is with the focus firmly on the 'complex pattern of repeated social activity and rhetorical performance arising in response to a recurrent situation' that I shall be exploring the intertextual critical exchange to determine whether its textual status merits the genre label and to examine the social purposes behind the text.

2.3. The usefulness of nomenclature

Before looking in more detail at our texts, it might be a timely moment to comment on their name – or rather – their lack of one. It is surely odd that the type of texts which we are about to examine has lived and flourished in the shadow of the research article for some considerable time but until now has escaped acquiring any standardized name. It is perhaps this lack of a recognized name that may help explain its neglect by genre analysts.

But this lack of a readily identifiable label for certain communicative activities is accepted without difficulty by Swales:

If there are genre names with no genres attached to them, so must there be genres without a name..(1990:57)

What is surprising, however, is that when Swales, focusing on his own professional sphere of operation, later states of the research article (p.177) that:

..the RA has a dynamic relationship with all the other public research process genres.

he fails in the diagram he makes of these related genres to hint even at the existence of the research-process structure under study in our discussion. While accepting that abstracts, presentations, grant proposals, theses, dissertations, books and monographs are intimately associated with research articles, it is difficult to explain Swales' ignoring of this bipartite research-process related text-type which performs as useful a function as a number of the above genres in advancing academic debate. Of course, the absence of a readily identifying label may go some considerable way to explaining this oversight by Swales and its low profile in research circles. But this

absence of a standardized name and lack of debate on the attendant communicative purpose it provides impoverishes significantly our discourse community's ability to define fully how it achieves the expansion of consensus and how expert manipulators of its conventions can secure insider status, not to say ascendancy, in their sphere.

Applying Swales' comment that 'genre-naming can be generative' (1990:57) to the situation I found in analyzing these nameless bipartite generic structures, I hope, not to generate them (for that obviously has already been done), but to name them as 'intertextual critical exchanges' (ICEs) in the hope that by concretizing a nomenclature for them and attempting to identify their behavioral patterns, they can become more readily assimilable into the vocabulary of the applied linguistics community, thereby raising their profile in the praxis of academic debate and heightening their usefulness in attempts to shape opinion.

2.4. Relating the ICE to the RA

The intertextual critical exchange does not simply live in the shadow of the research article, it could not exist without it. So, at first sight, the ICE and the RA might appear to belong very much to the same family and to have much in common. The writer of the original article and the reacting reader may both see themselves as making a contribution to academic debate with a view to advancing the boundaries of their subject. As we shall see, however, this common goal calls into play very different approaches and techniques in the presentation of information.

The approach of the ICE in presenting its information and argument differs radically from that of the RA. For with the ICE we leave what is by now the familiar

generic path of the research article - new propositional content embedded in recognized authority which situates the author in a revitalized insider niche (Berkenkotter and Huckin, 1995; Scollon, 1994; Myers, 1990; Hyland, 2000)- to explore more difficult, far less well-charted territory. In this new landscape, even if the aim remains apparently similar – the expansion of the discourse community’s understanding and the establishment of academic consensus around that new understanding – the operational strategies and tactics are quite different. At times, as we shall see, in place of grounded, neutral (or seemingly neutral) authorial proposition of the kind familiar to readers of research articles, there will be overtly subjective opposition whose various nuances of disagreement with the trigger texts will be realized by a series of persuasion techniques aimed at realigning reader consensus around this opposition.

What these persuasion techniques might be - and how they are realized on the pages of *TESOL Quarterly* - will prove central to this study.

To return to the terminology of the opening of this chapter, we shall be examining these texts to determine if we come upon sufficient of Miller’s *typification of rhetorical action* and Swales’ and Bhatia’s *consistency of communicative purposes* to justify applying the label of *genre* to these texts.

3. SHAPING OPINION : ORTHODOXY, VARIATION AND VARIANTS.

The previous chapter suggested that the aim of the texts under examination, like the aim of the research article, was to expand the discourse community's present understanding and to establish academic consensus around a new understanding. Before exploring in later chapters how this new understanding is achieved in this particular construct, perhaps we might begin by looking at how this is brought about in the broader field of the academic research article, the trigger text for these bipartite exchanges.

Although this enquiry is situated in texts from the applied linguistics community, its importance transcends the boundaries of this particular community. For the making of a contribution to the accumulated knowledge of academic disciplines obliges researchers, whatever their sphere of operation, to turn – their research completed - to text in order to argue their propositional claims to their discourse community peers. Hunston (1993) follows Latour and Woolgar (1979) in suggesting that the research article has a social role to play in bringing a researcher's work to the knowledge-bank of their academic community where it joins that general debate through which knowledge advances. (See also Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995; Myers, 1990; Hyland, 2000).

To be successful, however, that is to say, to have the proposed claim accepted, a researcher must attempt to square the discourse circle: s/he must seek to persuade the reading public without, however, seeming to be overtly persuasive.

The result of the *construction* of a fact is that it appears unconstructed by anyone; the result of rhetorical *persuasion* in the agnostic field is that participants are convinced that they have not been convinced. (Latour and Woolgar 1979:240.)

Findings speak louder than words, or should do, the argument goes, but it is only through words, paradoxically, that the findings can be interpreted. To render the act of persuasion as inconspicuous as possible, in order to facilitate acceptance by the targeted academic audience, the research article has long relied on situating current claims within the context of past research, thereby confirming its writer as someone who is familiar with the broader discipline framework and someone who is working within that framework to extend its scope; someone who, to borrow terms from Sinclair (1986), knows how to balance averral with attribution. By integrating previous authority into their work researchers create around their research ‘a credible writer ethos’ (Hyland 2002 :115).

3.1. The RA and ICE: two perspectives on opinion shaping

The bipartite exchange which forms the basis of this enquiry, while continuing to avail itself of a tradition which situates new propositions within past research like its parent form, attempts to create ‘credible writer ethos’ (Hyland 2002:115) by resorting to certain persuasive textualization techniques, only some of which share a common parentage with the research article. In the ICE we have considerable citing of authority to underpin claims and, in the opening comments at least, considerable care in a sympathetic presentation of the writerly ‘persona’. As we advance through the text, however, we see developments which are somewhat removed from research article opinion-shaping behaviour. Among these we note unhedged critical comments, direct challenges to the scholarship and understanding of the interlocutor and an

insistence on discourse which is frequently displacive i.e. discourse which seeks to displace the views of the interlocutor and replace them directly with speaker-favoured perspectives. Indeed, it was the striking discrepancy between the blunter textualization tactics of the ICE when compared with the RA that attracted me to discover more about this duality of approach in research-process texts.

These are bold tactics for the ICE to pursue when the aim is to shape opinion persuasively. Nevertheless, it is by the successful manipulation of these social actions and text-constructing processes that ICE authors and readers hope to have their revitalized knowledge claims accepted by the general reading public in their drive to arrive at discourse community consensus and, indeed, ascendancy.

3.1.1. Ascendancy and the Primary Knower.

In 1.2. we introduced the term ‘Primary Knower’ to characterize the role of participants engaged in challenging previously published claims with the aim of displacing these claims with new propositions of their own. With these ascendancy-seeking textualisation manoeuvrings, participants seek to be seen as the Primary Knower in the discussion.

The term is first noted in the literature in 1981 when it was adopted by three researchers, all working in different areas of inquiry. Berry (1981) adopted it for use in extending the discussion of IRF exchanges as developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and later by Coulthard and Brazil (1979). In the exchanges discussed by Berry, the Primary Knower is appealed to by the ‘Secondary Knower’ for authoritative information. The Secondary Knower speaks first in Berry’s exchange cited below.

Son:	which English cathedral has the tallest spire
Father:	Salisbury
Son:	oh

The Father is the second person to speak in this exchange and ‘indicates he knows the information’ and ‘confers upon the information a kind of stamp of authority’ (1981:126), hence the Father’s role of Primary Knower in the exchange.

Tadros, in her unpublished PhD thesis of the same year, uses the term in a rather different manner, yet the idea of authority again marks its usage. Swales (1981:53) makes allusion to her work when discussing what was Move 3 – Preparing for Present Research - in his 1981 move-structure format:

As Tadros (1981) has observed in her detailed analysis of Prediction in an economics textbook, the type of authorial detachment implicit in a Reporting stage predicts a later involvement by the author in what has been reported, and that this takes the form of an evaluation. As she says ‘evaluation (of which Rebuttal is a specific type)...establishes the point of what has been reported’. Further, Evaluation enables the writer to re-enter the discourse as ‘Primary Knower’.....

To understand the above we must remember that Swales’ Move 2 at the time, unlike his 1990 model, dealt with Summarizing Previous Research. In other words, the writer in Move 2 has been *reporting* on earlier research and Swales, while accepting that reporting might not always be a value-free task, admits that Move 3 - Preparing for Present Research- sees the writer re-entering the discussion in *evaluative* rather than reporting mode and that this shift

..enables the writer to re-enter the discourse as ‘Primary Knower’.

As we shall see in our discussion in Chapter 6 of Entry Moves 2 and 3 in the intertextual critical exchanges examined here, there is a parallel dynamic from reporting (the term ‘overviewing’ is used in this corpus) to evaluation (of which a rebuttal, here too, ‘is a specific type’) which validates *prima facie* the borrowing of

the term. As we shall further see, however, this evaluation process continues well beyond the cross-over from reporting to evaluation in these two moves. Indeed, at their core, the texts revolve critically around evaluations, negations, displacements and replacements. In the hierarchy of knowledge claims, there is a constant manoeuvring by Reacting Readers and Responding Authors for prime position to be accorded to their propositions. 'Primary Knower' becomes, therefore, a term indispensable for a full discussion of writers' actions and ambitions as they jockey for the granting of discourse community ascendancy.

3.2. Shaping by pattern not prescription

While a certain measure of researchers' credibility derives from situating their work and academic identity within a framework of past research, their coherence derives in part from familiarity with textualization procedures which are accepted practice within the discourse community in question. In other words, a researcher helps argue her/his case when s/he shows a mastery of the appropriate structuring strategies for whatever research-process genres under consideration. But, far from being prescriptive, as Swales (1981, 1985, 1990) and Bhatia (1993, 2004) are at pains to underline, the recurring regularities they and others (e.g. Miller 1984, 1994; Dudley-Evans 1986; Bazerman 1994; Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995) have found in research writing are seen as probabilistic. The researchers in question are more preoccupied (Hart 1986) with seeking patterns rather than imposing them. Genre conventions are seen by Bhatia (1993:40) as more of a springboard than a straitjacket :

..we must realize that we can be more effectively creative in communication when one is well aware of the rules and conventions of the genre.

But adds;

..discourse needs a model which is rich in socio-cultural, institutional and organizational explanation....and discriminating enough *to highlight variation rather than uniformity* in functional language use. (1983:11)[My italics]

Writing in 2004, Bhatia goes even further:

Analysing genre..with any expectation of a high degree of predictability or certainty is like analyzing the stock market in a highly complex and volatile economic environment, where it is almost impossible to take into account all the variables contributing to the movements of the stock market. (p.113)

For a full understanding of the texts we are about to explore we should not lose sight of the inevitability of variation and unpredictability, for what we are about to see is not simply an attempt to establish any series of recurring linear generic moves which may exist in these texts. Typifications of rhetorical actions notwithstanding, we shall be interested in studying also those typification variants which differentiate one text from another but which still permit them recognition as being consistent, one to another, in their communicative purpose -and which still permit them, their variety notwithstanding, a claim to generic integrity.

4. TOWARDS AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The title of this thesis and its earlier sections make it abundantly clear that the final analytical framework selected to discuss these RR and AR texts was generic in nature. This research project did not start out, however, with any *a priori* assumptions as to which analytical method would provide the fullest description of this rich linguistic field of professional exchanges. As it turned out, it was the generic approach that finally accounted most fully for

- the linguistic action surveyed
- the social and professional goals targeted.

But the final choice was by no means a foregone conclusion. Three quite different approaches were also reviewed and considered before any decision was taken.

4.1. CDA and the ICE

Although *TESOL Quarterly* is one of the flagship journals of the world of TESOL/Applied Linguistics, even a preliminary reading of the intertextual critical exchanges which form the corpus for study here reveals that ideological concerns feature as prominently as linguistic ones. Ethnocentricity issues affecting the treatment of foreign students in America are raised in RR/AR 8 and RR/AR 9 and touched on again in RR/AR 10; opposing views of peace studies courses emerge in RR/AR 7; racism and social inequalities are discussed in RR/AR 15. (See Chapter 5 for relevant Readers and Authors.) We should not be surprised by any of this, however, for as Stubbs (1996:130) points out:

Much recent text analysis, especially within 'critical linguistics', starts from the Hallidayan assumption that all linguistic usage encodes representations of the world.

Closer reading of all the texts confirms that despite the ostensible foregrounding of language issues, critical discourse analysts would be correct to detect sociopolitical ideologies driving the sub-text to a greater or lesser degree of transparency. Again, we should not be surprised. As Fairclough (2001: 230) points out:

[CDA] opens a dialogue between disciplines concerned with linguistic and semiotic analysis.....and disciplines concerned with the theorizing and researching of social processes and social change.

Given the current global hegemony of the English language, it would be short-sighted for any TESOL/ Applied Linguistics practitioner to claim that s/he was engaged in an ideologically neutral activity (Edge 1996, 2003). Accepting the Hallidayan premise expressed above that 'all linguistic usage encodes representations of the world', language teachers and teacher educators are caught up, willy-nilly, in a social process wherein texts and their encoded world representations are central. In this sense, the intertextual critical exchanges offer a rich field for exploration. For not only do they feature a number of the topics at the heart of CDA – racism, hegemonic struggles of culture and language, social inequalities of migrant workers etc. – but the participants in this dialogic engagement – language professionals for the most part - are perhaps more than usually skilled in precisely-expressed linguistic pronouncements, ripe for textual unravelling.

Furthermore, the word 'intertextual' has itself an added resonance in the world of CDA. Bakhtin (1986) emphasized the dialogic quality of texts. Kristeva (1986) further underlined the fact that any text is explicitly or implicitly in dialogue

with another text. And here, in these *TESOL Quarterly* exchanges, we have that dialogue apparently in sharp focus.

In planning a possible approach to analyzing the texts, I began by taking the most obviously CDA-oriented topics as starting points for a more nuanced group of subject headings which might later present themselves. As indicated earlier, some of the most obvious of these would include racism, ethnocentricity and social inequality, all mainstream topics for CDA-type analysis.

This process had not gone very far before a fundamental problem with this approach began to present itself. The 15 sets of texts certainly offered adequate linguistic material for sociopolitical unpacking - but then so did many other texts dealing with these topics. By adopting such an approach to the analysis of the 30 texts, I would undoubtedly be uncovering the enactment of abuse, dominance and inequality in textual terms, but would I be revealing the characteristic attributes of this particular group of texts? I had been attracted to their study by their distinctive linguistic features which marked them out from other research writing processes. While studying how their social agenda was formalized through language structures would undoubtedly be instructive at a socio-political level, I was not similarly convinced of the benefit to anyone interested primarily in understanding better those features that set the intertextual critical exchanges apart from other writings in *TESOL Quarterly* or, indeed, from other academic writing.

Furthermore, while opposing views on a subject such as ethnocentricity might form the focus of the debate, I was conscious of another form of hegemonic struggle unfolding in the text. Reacting Reader and Responding Author

appeared to be vying for discourse community consensus using a variety of recursive socio-rhetorical techniques as interesting to unpick as those socio-political messages to be decoded from the texts' linguistic behaviour. While not being mutually exclusive, indeed, complementary in some ways, it was the socio-rhetorical activities in the texts that I wished to explore, conscious, however, that these texts were an opportunity for other researchers to exploit to make explicit the cognitive interface between discourse structures and a social context in a way that van Dijk (1998, 2001) still sees as relatively unexplored.

4.2. The case for corpus linguistics.

Alerted by Hoey (2001) to Mauranen's argument (1998) that future genre research would do well to ally itself with corpus study and that corpus linguistics could profitably become more genre-conscious and develop corpora with specific genres in mind, I began to reflect on the usefulness of such an approach to my own study of intertextual critical exchanges.

I had already encountered in my teaching the work of Johns (1991, 1988) and had used many of his ideas to good effect in remedial grammar teaching. Furthermore, McEnery and Wilson (1996) point out that corpus study has already a track-record not just in formal linguistic explorations but also in cultural studies, social psychology and discourse analysis. Yates (2001:110-11) warns, however, that linguists interested in the sociological, cultural and social-psychological aspects of language are currently obliged to employ the kind of qualitative methods that are still not adequately developed:

To say that this range of methods follows a well-defined set of rules, or that methods are coherent across disciplines would be untrue. Corpus methods, especially in the area of discourse analysis, are still 'under development' and there are few full and detailed discussions of the practical and methodological implications of such an approach to the study of language and communication.

It was precisely these 'practical and methodological implications' that were foremost in my mind. At the time of launching this research, I was living in the south of France and working in the ESL department of a college where I appeared to be the only member of staff with an interest in corpus linguistics. Although the archives of *TESOL Quarterly*, my planned corpus, were already electronically stored, I would obviously need considerable expert help with adapting CAQDAS (computer assisted qualitative data analysis software) to analyze these texts. For this help, I felt I would need more Aston-based assistance than would be easily compatible with full-time employment in France. Nor was I confident that I had the requisite computer skills to optimize my use of the analytical instrument once in place, feeling that technological matters might well regularly intrude on linguistic ones. Nevertheless, these were difficulties that were surmountable.

Methodological considerations, however, were of considerably more concern. Stubbs (1996, 2001) pointed the way to a certain extent: word frequency lists would assist in pinpointing the terms and topics most favoured by Reacting Readers and Responding Authors. My initial exploration of the texts had revealed some obvious candidates for closer examination: words such as *problem*, *confusion*, *difficulty*, *dichotomy*. What would a wide-spanned lexical-node survey of such words tell me about the co-text on either side of the node? What items would

collocate with *I wish to...* or *What I did was...* and those other introductory phrases to rebuttals that, even without a computer, I was able to detect. I also had noted that unhedged declaratives *appeared* to outnumber hedged modals. Was this true? What did this tell me about the frequency of face-threatening acts in ICEs? Were these mitigated in some other way? *However*, and *But* in lead position in a sentence seemed to predominate over *And* or *Moreover*, but was this, also, true? I felt that corpus linguistics could help me go beyond intuition and provide facts about actual language behaviour once I had thought through and specified the precise areas for interrogation.

The benefits of such an approach were obvious, but so, too, were growing doubts. Such attested performance unquestionably built an incontrovertible picture of actual language use, but it was a picture decontextualized from the broader discursive framework. For example, early on in RR3, we come across the following:

There are a number of strategies, such as watching television in the target language or paying attention to what people say, in which listening is an essential component. All the conversation strategies of the SILL involve listening. Researchers and teachers have repeatedly used the SILL to obtain information on strategies for listening.

Apart from its fondness for unhedged indicative use, such a relatively bland extract might not attract much interest in a language search of the kind discussed above. Decontextualized, this extract might simply be the answer to two possible questions?

- What might I do to improve my L2 listening skills?
- Has the SILL anything to offer me in terms of improving my listening?

In fact, when we put the extract back into its socio-rhetorical context and treat it as discourse rather than simply text, we discover that it has been preceded by the following:

LoCastro observes that the SILL includes 'no strategies specifically addressing listening as a means to learn (p.42)'. We find this not only puzzling but also misleading and untrue.

Recontextualized into the socio-rhetorical discursive framework from which it came, the first extract is seen to be not the information-oriented answer to two possible questions but the *counterclaim* to a perceived error. As such, it is a key element in the Reacting Reader's socio-rhetorical action to achieve ascendancy - but there is nothing in the textual trace that would betray this.

It seemed that while the findings of computer searches of texts might well *alert* me at times to activities of discursive significance in the co-textual vicinity, this significance could not be culled from the computer-screen data *itself*. It was precisely the socio-rhetorical manoeuvrings in these texts which had attracted me to ICEs in the first place. As I studied them, the texts seemed to reveal writers weaving a variety of recursive patterns with increasingly-familiar discursive activities. While corpus linguistics could shed much useful light on the decisions and choices made about language selection, it was as much the decisions and choices made about social processes that I wanted to look more closely at.

While Stubbs (1996, 2001) and Yates (2001) held out constructive possibilities for an analysis of these texts by corpus linguistic means, it was Widdowson (2000: 7) who articulated my underlying concern and led me

finally to look elsewhere for an analytical instrument. Speaking of corpus analysis he remarks:

It can only analyse the textual traces of the processes whereby meaning is achieved: it cannot account for the complex interplay of linguistic and contextual factors whereby discourse is enacted.

The search for another perspective on a coherent discussion of the texts led me next to turn to the many processes of evaluation instantiated in the texts. Evaluation within these texts, in Widdowson's terms, could certainly account for 'a complex interplay of linguistic..factors', but what of the 'contextual' ones 'whereby discourse is enacted'?

4.3. Evaluation as a frame for analysis

Even the most fleeting appraisal of the texts cannot fail to notice the important linguistic role that evaluation plays in their construction. A principled decision as to its centrality in the exploration of the texts was necessary. For although much of each exchange may focus on evaluation, we need also to determine to what extent the texts manifest a rhetorical and social agenda which might be neglected by structuring our analytical framework exclusively around its ability to evaluate. An initial reading of the texts, however, confirmed the strong presence of evaluative components in the textualization process. What importance, therefore, should be given to them in constructing our analytical instrument?

Much – but by no means all - of the core content of these texts certainly revolves around what is variously referred to, among other terms, as 'evaluation', 'stance', 'appraisal', or 'attitude'. The literature is not short of discussion of these

terms. Halliday (1994), Martin (2000), Eggins and Slade (1997), Bybee and Fleischmann (1995), Conrad and Biber (2000), Thompson and Hunston (2000) and Hunston (2000) all contribute importantly to the debate.

Thompson and Hunston (2000) and Hunston (2000) favour the superordinate term *evaluation* as

...evaluation is the broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about. (Thompson and Hunston 2000:5)

Others prefer to break the term down further. Halliday (1994) fields one of the more complex views of evaluation on offer, suggesting no one superordinate to define it, preferring to break evaluation down into conditions of *modality* (e.g. the likelihood of an event happening) and *attitudinal meaning* (e.g. goodness/desirability of the said event). He further sub-divides modality into *modalization* (relating to probability and usuality) and *modulation* (relating to obligation and inclination) (Thompson and Hunston 2000). Martin (2000) and Eggins and Slade (1997) also prefer to sub-divide terms. For Martin, his 'appraisal' encompasses three attitudinal sub-categories: *affect*, *judgement* and *appreciation*. Bybee and Fleischmann (1995), too, make distinctions in categories, separating modality into *epistemic* (to do with probability) and *deontic* (to do with obligation) and *evaluation* (to do with goodness/desirability).

Given the frequency in the texts under study of statements both calling into question the reliability of other professionals' judgment and indicating often quite strong feelings about the writer's attitude to these judgments, the model of Conrad and Biber (2000) required serious study as a potential analyzing instrument. They use

the term 'stance' to cover the expression of personal feelings and assessments .

'Stance' further sub-divides in their usage of it to:

- (1) epistemic stance, commenting on the certainty (or doubt), reliability, or limitations of a proposition, including comments on the source of the information;
- (2) attitudinal stance, conveying the speaker's attitudes, feelings, or value judgements;
- (3) style stance, describing the manner in which the information is being presented.

(Conrad and Biber 2000:57)

Although Conrad and Biber's work here is focused on adverbial markers in text, this tripartite division of stance may be applied usefully to discussing text more broadly.

Cases in point where both epistemic and attitudinal, or at least implied attitudinal, stance spring to the fore are fairly common in the TQ texts:

- a) Moreover, Oxford claims that television viewing requires listening. Again, this is true, but there have to be English-language television programs.
- b) To begin, Hamp-Lyons extrapolates most of her observations on TOEFL preparation materials from a rather small and decidedly unrepresentative sample of five TOEFL texts....
- c) A third problem with Brown and Hudson's treatment of the topic seems to stem from their framework, which takes a testing-based rather than a classroom-based approach and therefore misses many significant issues..

Here we have the source of the information identified, the limitations of the information explained and a clear conveying of the writer's non-supportive attitude to what has been imparted. Like the academic texts studied by Conrad and Biber, these texts were not slow to signal epistemic stance, nor, indeed attitudinal stance.

While finding Conrad and Biber's analytical approach useful when exploring short stretches of text with regard to their epistemic and attitudinal stance, its usefulness as an exploratory instrument did not help when writers turned away in the central sections of the text from evaluative positions to make statements such as:

- a) I have immersed myself in the sociocultural context under study in that I have lived and worked in Japan for over 10 years and have taught Japanese learners in a variety of situations.....
- b) Dewey (1916/1966: Ratner 1939) and other American pragmatists addressed the problem of theory/practice dualism in the 20th century. Their work has recently come to fruition in the work of some of the postmodern writers, often members of traditionally underrepresented groups (Wareheime 1993), in search for a more extensive acceptance of the socially constructed nature of education as a quintessential teaching and learning experience.
- c) I confess I am a worrier; my now grown children remind me regularly of that vice. Indeed, my tendency is to take what I read too seriously, always to be concerned with improving my teaching (and my students' learning), and at least initially to be intimidated by the proclamation of others.

Here we clearly see an activity other than evaluation being undertaken. In a) we see the writer deepening our awareness of the professional context in which she works. In b) it is a preparatory literature review that is being set out prior to other comments. In c) the writer seeks to broaden our knowledge of her personality prior to answering criticism. Clearly, to be fully effective, a suitable analytical model for these texts needs to be capable of addressing more than the linguistic formulation of evaluation in the texts. Furthermore, when we examine the entry and exit sections in more detail, we note certain typical procedural realizations:

- a) In my Forum piece in *TESOL Quarterly* (Vol.31, No.2, Summer 1997), I said that my purpose was 'to provoke thought and discussion' (p.359). Therefore, I am pleased that Professor Jones, by taking time to respond to my brief essay, has given me the opportunity to engage in a public dialogue about issues that I feel are very important for L2 writing professionals.
- b) Again, my purpose was not to criticize ETS, the TOEFL, or any specific test, testing agency or test preparation materials. It was to raise an issue of professional ethics for consideration by the profession.

In a) the writer is primarily engaged in what we recognize as conventional text-launching politeness procedures before addressing the main issues (although it could be argued that the references to 'Professor Jones', being 'pleased' and 'issues that I feel are very important' retain a certain epistemic and attitudinal resonance). In b)

there is a final attempt to re-clarify the focus of the original research article before the author bows out from her response to the reader's reaction. Such socio-rhetorical actions and others like them, (e.g. calling for further research, recommending appropriate action etc.) which we shall discover in exploring the texts, are sufficiently common to prompt us to seek a more all-embracing analytical model than the one offered by the strictly evaluative parameters of epistemic and attitudinal stance, or, indeed, of the parameters of evaluation in general.. In other words, our model needs to account not only for evaluation but also for rhetorical devices and socially targeted activities that may help shape the discourse framework.

What we are seeking here is a discourse analysis instrument for studying these exchanges which must encompass both the ability to describe text *and* characterize social and rhetorical action. Textual analysis alone is not enough to bring about the desired social end, although some have been misled into thinking so. Brumfit (2001: 26) sees Swales genre-analysis work as :

..an effort to pull the academic tradition of English for Specific Purposes back towards textual analysis..

Grateful as we are to Brumfit to drawing Swales' work to our attention, we cannot ignore the fact that Brumfit's gloss of Swales' work on genre is somewhat wide of the mark. Textual analysis of course plays its part, but it is far from being an end in itself. To Swales himself, his work is a great deal more than a pulling back towards textual analysis. To him, as we said in Chapter 2:

..genres are communicative vehicles for the achievement of goals.(1990:46)

In this he is backed by Miller (1984:151) who, from her rhetorician's point of perspective, puts the case even more strongly, as, again, we have previously suggested:

..a rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centred not on the substance or form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish.

The above citations from Swales and Miller in their emphasis on both language *and* social action bring us to confront the idea of genre-driven analysis as a potentially viable means of exploring our texts. Its attraction becomes even stronger when we read in Freedman and Medway (1994:9) that a genre-based analytical framework of the kind mentioned above focuses on

.....unpacking complex relations between text and context.

Given that it is genre-based, we have a framework which permits exploration of those linguistic typifications detectable in the texts and which, at the same time, concerns itself with social and professional goals. Once we have determined these goals, according to Miller, we organize the surface structures in what we believe is the best way to achieve these social ends. Examining how evaluation is handled linguistically certainly plays its part, but it must do so in the larger perspective of the achievement of real world aims. Strengthening this view is Freedman (1993: 194) who follows Devitt:

..the notion of genre has in recent years been reconceived so that the recurring textual regularities which characterize genres are themselves seen as secondary to, and a consequence of, the action that is being performed through the texts in response to recurring socio-cultural contexts (Devitt 1993)

Put briefly, a genre-based approach, one with a bias towards social action while still exploring surface linguistic features, would appear to fulfill the aims we set ourselves earlier for the required analytical framework to unpack these texts.

4.4. If genre, which school?

Although we have already quoted Miller and Swales, indicating that what has been called the North American school of genre has already caught our attention, we cannot pretend that this so-called ‘school’ is the only candidate in the field. While the above two scholars, in the company of Bakhtin (1986) and Bazerman (1988), have done much to establish the critical credentials of their approach to genre-analysis, an alternative version has been pioneered by the so-called ‘Sydney’ school, led initially by Halliday (1976, 1978, 1988, 1989) and Hasan (1976, 1985). (See also Christie and Martin 1997)

While both ‘schools’ lay much store by genre’s role in bringing about social ends, they diverge quite radically in their perceptions of genre itself. For the Sydney school, the educational aspect of genre was a way of empowering the socially and academically disadvantaged. Talking of the Sydney school, Freadman (1994:192) explains:

They began by identifying those genres that confer power (mainly school genres associated with the sciences and social sciences); they then explicated the features of these genres using the Hallidayan socially-based system of textual analysis. On that basis, they devised programs in which teachers were expected to explicate the features of these genres to their pupils, beginning in the earliest years of schooling.

But already we see that such a model is not perhaps the best one for our activities here. There is an implicit assumption in such an approach that genres are

static entities, for how else can they be taught? And if they are not static, why should they be taught? We quickly understand why Luke (1994) saw the limitations of such a view of genre studies when he noted that the emphasis on the direct transmission of text-types could lead to uncritical reproduction of the discipline.

A view of genre which favours prescriptivism does not seem to help us much in our attempts to characterize the texts we have before us here. For a start, our writers are established practitioners in the field of applied linguistics and could hardly be described as being disadvantaged or in need of acculturation in the art of reacting and responding. And while we shall see that certain typified regularities occur, our texts are quite fluid in structure within certain limits and there is, in Anne Freedman's (1994:45) term, room for considerable 'play' in them which allows the primacy of the individual's context, attitude and perspectives to privilege the language choices. (See also Bakhtin (1986:79) who talks of generic forms being 'much more flexible, plastic and free' than other linguistic constructs.)

In others words, an analytical model that is centred on pedagogy and prescriptivism would seem less useful in our explorations than one which describes not only the typifications of linguistic behaviour in a group of texts but also, much more interestingly, the fluidity and freedom that exists within that group while still allowing its claim to generic integrity.

We are, it would appear, leaning towards the North American model. Or more particularly, what has become known as Swales' genre-analysis model whereby the schematic structure is examined in terms of Moves and Steps. This appears to offer us an effective means of discussing both linguistic choice and social action, one which

balances its role as a ‘communicative vehicle’ with that of its ability for ‘the achievement of goals.’ This interest in the choices open to writers, linguistic structures and social interaction is pre-echoed by de Beaugrande and Dressler in their pioneering work in this area:

Whereas the conventional linguistic question might be: “What structures can analysis uncover in a language?”, our question would be rather: “How are discoverable structures built through operations of decision and selection, and what are the implications for communicative interaction?” (1981:15)

It is those ‘operations of decision and selection’ and their surface language structures which will be addressed in Chapters 6, 7 and 8 of this study and ‘the implications for communicative interaction’ in Chapter 12.

But first, since the model often associated with the name of Swales appears to offer the most suitable analytical instrument for these texts, we need to look a little more closely at it.

4.5. The moves and steps perspective.

In 2.2.3. we have already noted Swales’ pioneering work on research article introductions drawn from 48 articles from the fields of Molecular Physics, Solid State Physics, Electronics and Chemical Engineering, the Biology/Medical fields and the fields of Social Sciences. Here (Swales 1981:21) he introduces one of the terms for with which he has subsequently become closely associated: the move.

I began to question the utility for this type of Applied Discourse study of a text analysis that divided texts into sections and then analysed the structure of these sections. Such an approach led to an analysis of product, whereas a process analysis that attempted to identify the obligatory and optional *moves* a conventional journal-author might make in the construction of a text could well be more directly beneficial for the kinds of application I had in mind.
(Italics added)

By 1990, the 4-Move format he had earlier detected in research articles had become modified to his 3-Move CARS model (Creating A Research Space). Here he also breaks down the Move into its constituent parts which he refers to as Steps. For Swales the CARS model for article introductions is as follows:

Move 1 Establishing a territory	
Step 1	Claiming centrality and/or
Step 2	Making topic generalization(s) and/or
Step 3	Reviewing items of previous research
Move 2 Establishing a niche	
Step 1	Counter-claiming or
Step 2	Indicating a gap or
Step 3	Question-raising or
Step 4	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 RA structure

Table 1 Swales' CARS model for article introductions

Here we see textual organization discussed not in terms of the schematic patterns of individual writers but as community-wide socio-cognitive patterns as detected by investigation and attested by empirical evidence from across various sciences.

Initially, genre studies foregrounded the organizational force of move structures (Bhatia 2004; Pare and Smart 1994), but as the nineties advanced there was

increasing attention shown to the social action these moves encapsulated. Together, they were seen as

...a complex pattern of repeated social activity and rhetorical performance arising in response to a recurrent situation. (Pare and Smart 1994:146)

Swales was quite clear about the ownership of such genres. They belonged to the discourse community who made use of them:

Discourse communities are sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals. One of the characteristics that established members of these discourse communities possess is a familiarity with the particular genres that are used in the communicative furtherance of those sets of goals. In consequence, genres are the properties of the discourse communities. (1990:9)

He was equally clear about what directed the text-constructing actions of these communities:

It is communicative purpose that is the prototypical criterion for genre identity.

All in all, we see the Swalesian model of Moves and Steps as a useful analytical tool in exploring the 30 texts in this corpus. Moves and Steps are terms which can help identify the socio-cognitive patternings that can be detected in the ground-plan of the exchanges; they identify not only the constituent parts of the organizational framework but also the communicative purpose of each part in terms of social action. Describing how these 'communicative vehicles' (Swales 1990:46) are constructed requires linguistic examination of the textual regularities that become evident.

It remains to be seen to what extent the sociorhetorical network in question here evinces familiarity with the socio-cognitive patterns awaiting to be discovered in

these texts and whether at the end of our Moves and Steps analysis they can, in fact, be accorded genre status.

5. METHODOLOGY

The focus of this research is on the interaction of language and social life. Or put another way, this is an investigation of how linguistic structures are built to achieve certain social ends. As such, it is an analysis calling for

a mode of description that is jointly ethnographic and linguistic.(Hymes 1974:39)

This description is ethnographic in that it attempts to build up a picture of how a group of applied linguists organizes its intertextual critical exchanges for publication in the journal *TESOL Quarterly* over a six-year period – 1995-2000. It searches, too, to understand the social goals implicit in these texts. This study is linguistic in that it interrogates language usage to ascertain its contribution to the overall achievement of these goals.

The referential framework for the procedural analysis of the study is, as has been discussed, that of Swales' (1981, 1990) genre-analysis model whereby the schematic structure is discussed in terms of Moves and Steps. A Move is a text segment which is oriented towards a single strategic discourse function such as 'Establishing a territory' as in Swales' 1990 CARS model. (*Create a Research Space*). A Step is a constituent tactical preference in the realization of such a Move e.g. 'Claiming centrality' and/or 'Making topic generalization(s)' and/or 'Reviewing items of previous research', all of these examples being Steps taken to realize the establishment of a territory in Swales' CARS' model. (See Table 1, 4.5.)

5.1. The corpus

All texts are taken from 'The Forum' section of *TESOL Quarterly*. The period sampled is from Vol. 29, No. 1 to Vol. 34, No.4. This covers a period of 6 years from 1995 to 2000. The issues up to and including Vol.33, No.1 were edited by Sandra McKay. Those from Vol.33, No.2. were edited by Carol Chapelle.

5.2. Selection criteria

Given that 'The Forum' does not appear in every issue of *TESOL Quarterly* – indeed it is not uncommon for it to appear only once a year – it was felt that a time-segment of 6 years would be necessary to give a sufficient body of texts for examination.

Selected texts are those where a reader reacts to an article previously published in 'TESOL Quarterly' and the original author(s) respond(s) to this reader (or joint effort by 2 readers). 5 exchanges were omitted from examination in the analysis. These involved an author responding to more than one reader in the same text. The metalanguage required to field the comments of 2 or more readers in one single text was noted within and without the sample universe as tending to diffuse to a certain extent the linguistic focus of the authorial responses which form the focus of one half of this enquiry.

5.3. The selected texts

This thesis examines 15 bilateral exchanges covered during this period. The names of the 'Reacting Reader' and 'Responding Author' are to be found in the following list. (Reader's name appears first.)

Each exchange involves two texts, referred to as RR ('A Reader Reacts') and AR ('The Author Responds'). The numbering system is detailed below.

	Approx. length
Vol 29. No.1	
RR1 & AR1. Chris Hall/Joy Reid	1520/1090
RR2 & AR2. Rebecca Oxford and John Green/Virginia LoCastro	2050/1140
RR3 & AR3. B. Kumaravadivelu/Dilin Liu	1020/1160
Vol. 30 No.2	
RR4 & AR4. Stephen Price/Bonny Norton Peirce	2290/1450
Vol. 31 No.1	
RR5 & AR5. Jo Hilder/Jill Sinclair Bell	1890/1560
Vol. 31 No. 4	
RR6 & AR6. Amy Schlessman/Karen Johnson	1425/1230
Vol.32. No.2	
RR7 & AR7. Nathan Jones/Tony Silva	1690/4260
Vol.32 No.4	
RR8 & AR8. Gayle Nelson/Ruth Spack	1790/1220
RR9 & AR9. Joan Carson/Ruth Spack	1640/2290
Vol.33 No.1	
RR10 & AR10. Yasuko Kanno/Kelleen Toohey	2280/1800
RR11 & AR11. Lynn Marie Glick/Geneva Napoleon Smitherman	470/750
Vol.33 No.2	
RR12 & AR12. Paul Wadden and Robert Hilke/Liz Hamp-Lyons	3150/1900
RR13 & AR13. Jennifer Ewald/Graham Crookes	1630/2140

Vol.33. No.4	
RR14 & AR14 Anthony Bruton/James Brown and Thom Hudson	1940/700
Vol. 34 No.4	
RR15 & AR15. Lynn Goldstein/Awad Ibrahim	760/1030
Average length of Readers' and Authors' texts	1703/1581

5.4. Consulting the writers

The main thrust of the conclusions of this thesis will rest on the empirical findings of the analysis which follows. Given, however, that the texts in question are relatively recent and that many of the writers are still operational in academic circles, I decided, where possible, to approach certain of them to comment on the discourse process which they had engaged in. Did the writers in the act of writing feel themselves to be operating within the parameters of a genre? Was that a reassuring, confidence-imparting feeling? Or did they feel restricted by what they felt was expected of them in this putative genre? What motivated them to write? What were their feelings at the time of writing? Has the passage of time changed their feelings towards their earlier response?

In a study aiming to examine the interaction of applied linguistics and social life and one placing itself firmly in the qualitative tradition of research, it would be regrettable not to have availed oneself of the valuable critical input of an additional perspective in rounding out the verdict on this corpus of texts in which discoverable linguistic structures appear to pose some thought-provoking questions on the social ends targeted.

5.5. Checking findings

If the findings of this inquiry are to be more than simply a series of claims relevant to 15 ICEs found in *TESOL Quarterly* from 1995 to 2000, they would benefit from some form of external validation. While the term *generalisability* is somewhat nervously regarded in the world of qualitative research, redolent as it is of inquiries conducted in the natural sciences, Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose the term *transferability* as being more appropriate to the contextualised world of qualitative investigations. The actual term selected, however, is not the key issue. That for Richards (2003:288) is 'the typicality or otherwise of the situation' which research has revealed.

In order to check the typicality of the situation found in these 15 ICEs, therefore, a further ICE, selected from the year 2002, was scrutinized for any detectable transferability of the characteristics described in Chapters 6, 7 and 8. The outcome of this validity check is discussed fully in Chapter 10.

This latter ICE is an exchange between Dwight Atkinson and Ryuko Kubota in Volume 36/ Number 1/Spring 2002. This was the issue of *TESOL Quarterly* current at the time of completion of the initial analysis of the 30 ICE texts.

6. ANALYSING THE TEXTS: OPENING MOVES

One of the basic questions at issue throughout this thesis concerns the status of the RR and AR texts. Can they justify a claim to form a genre or sub-genre of their own? If this body of texts can be said to enjoy such a status they will need to demonstrate certain common typifications of utterance and some shared framework of social intention, for such is the nature of genre theory as elaborated, amongst others already cited, by Miller (1984), Swales (1990) and Bazerman (1988). It is Bazerman (1994: 82) who reminds us that

..over a period of time individuals perceive homologies of circumstances that encourage them to see these as occasions for similar kinds of utterances. These typified utterances, often developing standardized formal features, appear as ready solutions to similar appearing problems. Eventually the genres sediment into forms so expected that readers are surprised or even uncooperative if a standard perception of the situation is not met by an utterance of the expected form.

The analysis which follows will attempt to seek out such ‘homologies of circumstances’ as may exist with a view to determining whether they elicit ‘similar kinds of utterances’ and, indeed, ‘standardized formal features’ that may serve as ‘ready solutions to similar appearing problems’ for Reacting Readers and Responding Authors alike. Do, in fact, these intertextual critical exchanges ‘sediment’ into forms which we as readers come to expect? And will the social intentions behind these forms manifest a similar commonality of response to those ‘similar appearing problems’?

6.1. Entry moves in RR and AR texts

In 10 out of the 15 RR texts and 10 out of the 15 AR texts, writers sought to strike a positive opening note in the first lines of the text, suggesting immediately that

there was at least some *a priori* discourse community consensus about how such texts should be launched. Two thirds of the writers had clearly identified a generic homology of circumstance which elicited from them a typified response. This move we shall call

6.2. Move 1 Acknowledging contribution positively

From our life experience of reading such intertextual critical exchanges in journal sections with titles such as ‘The Forum’, we suspect that what is to follow may well be less a glowing encomium of the trigger text than a fairly robust discussion of some of its perceived shortcomings. Yet 20 of the 30 RR and AR texts share a typified response in launching their texts with positive comments. (A further two performed a modified version of this. See 6.2.2.) We may well ask the source of such recurring behaviour. There is certainly no guidance on procedures to follow in *TESOL Quarterly’s* own “Information for Contributors” section at the rear of each issue. Nor in the growing literature of English for Academic Purposes have I been able to track down any discussion of launching procedures for such texts. (Indeed, it should be noted that such intertextual exchanges suffer in their entirety from quasi-total critical neglect.) It would appear that the warrant that such openings have is derived from usage (in turn related to Goffman’s idea of ‘face’ {discussed below}). Or, put another way, such openings manifest generic typification intuitively recognized by expert practitioners in such exchanges. This gesture has become so ‘sedimented’(in Bazerman’s phrase) in the minds of reacting readers and responding authors that two thirds of these expert practitioners performed it with Pavlovian

spontaneity, thus establishing an important item of evidence in our investigation of the claim to genre status for such exchanges. We look first at this move as performed in the 10 relevant RR texts:

- RR 1 Joy Reid's (article title) offers some constructive advice ..
- RR 3 I read B. Kumaravadivelu's article...with great interest and appreciation....The article is enlightening as well as thought provoking.
- RR 4 ..her attempt to deal with challenges raised by poststructural thought is gratifying.
- RR 5 Jill Sinclair's fascinating description and analysis of her own experience studying Chinese literary skills....raises important issues...
- RR 6 The title of Karen E. Johnson's...piece..makes it a must-read for language educators.
- RR 7 According to Tony Silva in his thoughtful..article....
- RR 10 Recently Kelleen Toohey wrote an insightful article on the socialization process...
- RR 12 ..it springs into existence ..as a result of the vital questions that Hamp-Lyons has shown the care and insight to raise....
- RR 13 Graham Crookes and Al Lehner's reflective and insightful account of their application of a critical pedagogical orientation.....
- RR 15 I was pleased to see the article (title) as Awad El Karim M. Ibrahim addresses important issues....

Of the 10 RR texts which performed this move perhaps only RR3, RR5 and RR6 reveal real enthusiasm. The other 7, while still respectful, channel their respect into fairly routine adjectives; the articles were 'insightful' (twice), 'thoughtful', 'reflective' and in them their authors offered advice that was 'constructive' and 'gratifying' in its aims and showed 'care and insight' with regard to the questions raised.

But it is not the sincerity – or absence of it - in these utterances that is of significance here. It is the very *routineness* which is of interest. For it is this routine quality to many of the comments which confirms our suspicion that this is a typified, internalized - dare one say - generic gesture, spontaneous more perhaps in its performance than in its feeling. This is a move, two thirds of the texts appear to say,

that offers a ready solution to ‘similar appearing problems’ (Bazerman 1994) , in this case the problem being how best to launch the discussion – and in a way that mitigates a potentially face-threatening act.

Similar statistics, not to say the same solution, launch the AR texts. 10 of the 15 texts choose to commence the exchange with a positive acknowledgement of the reader’s reaction. Again, sincerity is not our main concern, although as in the RR texts, only 3 (AR4, AR10, and AR12) might be said to be overtly enthusiastic.

AR4 I value this opportunity to engage in debate on postmodern thought

AR10 I am delighted to have the opportunity to respond to (title of article)

AR12 I was delighted to read Paul Wadden and Robert Hilke’s response to my Forum commentary and to have the opportunity to respond to it.

What is new here in this typification of the first move is the appearance of the word ‘opportunity’. Although less than ‘delighted’, two more AR texts mentioned the ‘opportunity’ this exchange offered.

AR7 I am quite pleased that Professor Jones, by taking time to respond to my brief essay, has given me the opportunity to engage in public dialogue....

AR15 ..the consumption side should certainly be thanked for giving me this opportunity to clarify and elaborate on some of the issues I addressed in my article.

This ‘opportunity’ (5 instances) is interesting in that what it acknowledges positively is something rather different from that which is welcomed in the RR texts. There the welcome was to the ‘article’, ‘piece’ and the ‘questions’ raised. Here the welcome is to a public ‘debate’, ‘dialogue’ and ‘response’ which might be seen as a way of deflecting criticism from the trigger text and glossing this critical comment, as they repeatedly say, rather as an ‘opportunity’ for expanded discussion.

Following in the spirit of welcoming discussion, but without using the word ‘opportunity’ is AR1:

I am grateful to those Quarterly readers who contacted me about my article. I especially appreciate the time and energy Chris Hall spent responding to my article. The satisfaction of writing an article is expanded by discussion with others.

While not mentioning ‘discussion’ but talking of one of its components – agreement – AR5 is similarly positive:

I enjoyed Jo Hilder’s piece very much and agreed with most of her comments.

One author, while not openly welcoming the reader’s reaction in any of the above ways, took the positive but slightly unusual step of showing sympathetic solidarity with her position:

AR13I primarily wish to second her concerns...

Others, while overtly welcoming reader reaction, might seem to some ‘Forum’ readers to be somewhat more tight-lipped in their acknowledgment of the contribution than AR 13:

AR2 Rebecca Oxford’s and John Green’s reaction to my research report is to be commended...

AR3 I thank Dilin Liu for a critical reading of my article.

Earlier, we suggested that the warrant for such positive acknowledgments of contributions derived from custom-driven usage. At this point we need to ask why usage in both RR and AR texts should adopt this particular form of text-launching procedure.

The answer perhaps lies in the notion of ‘face’ derived from Goffman (1967).

Brown and Levinson (1987:61) helpfully gloss it as follows:

- (i) 'face', the public self-image that every member [of society] wants to claim for himself, consisting of two related aspects:
 - (a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.
 - (b) positive face: the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants.

Much of what follows the opening move will constitute a FTA (Face Threatening Act) in that some of the points raised from the preceding trigger texts will come in for fairly fierce scrutiny by the writer of the subsequent text. Here we enter an area where 'positive face' discussed above risks violation in that the desire of the 'self-image' to be 'appreciated and approved of' is under threat. The pragmatics of academic politeness (indeed of politeness in general) require that some gesture be made to a fellow writer's positive self-image and to the positive image of his/her work if interactional breakdown is to be avoided. As Brown and Levinson explain (1987:210), redress for an upcoming FTA may take the form of thanks as a recognition of indebtedness from one writer to another for his/her comments, however unwelcome they may be – which helps explain this opening move in many AR texts. But what of the opening move in RR texts? Why the fairly general prevalence of positive acknowledgments of a rather different kind – complimentary rather than grateful? Once again, Brown and Levinson (1987:129) are helpful in suggesting that an upcoming FTA can also be defused by 'giving gifts' to the person on the receiving end of the forthcoming comments. These gifts, Brown and Levinson explain, need not be tangible but gifts which recognize human-relations wants such as the desire to be admired.

Hence the emollient initial move favoured by so many of the participants in both RR and AR texts. For as Brown and Levinson (1987:62) again remind us:

..a mere bow to face acts like a diplomatic declaration of good intentions.

And, indeed, as the texts progress, we understand better the force of that 'mere', for the tone can become less than diplomatic on occasion.

There is one more dimension to these acts of politeness which need to consider. In a study exploring the potentially generic nature of these texts, we would do well to remember that Goffman made much of the ritualistic nature of politeness, as Brown and Levinson remind us (1987:43)

The 'ritual' character of politeness has been much stressed by Goffman. One diagnostic of ritual is often held to be repetitive or pre-patterned behaviour.

But if 'repetitive or pre-patterned behaviour' is a 'diagnostic' of ritual, it is also a diagnostic of genre. The formulaic nature of this decorum (Coulmas 1979, 1981) at this opening stage in the text is a useful point to remember in examining the case for genre status of these texts.

6.2.1. An interesting case of negative politeness strategy

In those RR texts which we have already discussed, the mitigating of the face-threatening act before criticism followed conventional lines; a complimentary gesture to the trigger text was made before some less supportive comment was launched. In the case of those AR texts where the Authors claim to see the critical comments of Readers as an 'opportunity', however, we see an interesting variation on the concept of negative politeness strategy. Negative politeness strategies, as Brown and Levinson remind us (1987:70) are normally addressed by speakers to hearers to indicate the

speakers have no desire to impede or impose on the lives of hearers and allow hearers an 'out' from any perceived potential imposition.

Negative politeness, thus, is essentially avoidance-based, and realizations of negative politeness strategies consist in assurances that the speaker recognizes and respects the addressee's negative face wants ..

Now, while criticism of a hearer's work cannot strictly be glossed as an imposition, it would appear to challenge or impede, albeit perhaps only temporarily, the ready acceptance of the hearer as a 'Primary Knower' in the exchange and as such cannot be welcome to the ears of any would-be 'Primary Knower'. So, by interpreting the critical challenge as an 'opportunity' rather than as anything more negative addressed to them by speakers, hearers (here authors) thereby award *themselves* an 'out' from having been criticized or challenged, thus curiously subverting the normal polarities of speaker/hearer negative politeness strategies. This is avoidance-based behaviour which refuses to see the Reader's action as injurious in any way to the Author's negative face, going as far as to gloss it rather as something as positive as an 'opportunity'.

Even in the remaining 5 AR texts where the word 'opportunity' was not mentioned, Authors' opening moves avoided incorporating any vocabulary hinting at umbrage having been taken or face having been threatened. One was 'grateful' and felt 'satisfaction' at being able to discuss her article with others; another 'enjoyed' the exchange; one went as far as to 'second' concerns raised. One highly critical RR text was 'commended' by the Author and an equally critical Reader was thanked for some rather sharp comments. All in all, these 20 Readers and Authors showed alertness to

the needs of 'face' in shaping their opening move. Readers with their regard for positive 'face' did so more conventionally perhaps than Authors whose self-awarded 'outs' to criticism in their opening move gave a novel slant to the more usual implementation of negative face-saving strategies and by so doing established one of the more intriguing aspects of the text launching procedures discerned here.

6.2.2. Alternative versions of Move 1

Reminding us that genres are 'sites of stability and change' (Berkentotter and Huckin (1995:6), RR2 and RR14 are of particular interest. They suggest 'stability' in that positive acknowledgment is still in the air and yet there is clear evidence of 'change' in the way the positive acknowledgment is manipulated:

RR2 As strategy researchers who frequently work with SILL, we were at first delighted to see Virginia LoCastro's article....We felt we would be receiving new information.....We also thought we might find some interesting results....

RR14 As a non-specialist in language assessment, I began to read Brown and Hudson's article (title) with interest and expectation....

Both texts are quick to show that they approached the trigger research article with an initial willingness to be positive, but this willingness was undermined by perceived shortcomings in the text. (The articulations of these shortcomings are discussed fully in the next section.) This openness of mind is perhaps more marked in RR2 where 'we were *at first* delighted' and 'felt we *would* be receiving new information' and 'also thought we *might* find some interesting results'.{my italics}. This particular adverbial phrase and these particular modals draw attention to positive expectations that were somehow later left unfulfilled. RR14 also invokes the idea of

unfulfilled anticipation as he began to read ‘with interest and expectation..’ which, again, as we shall read later, did not live up to the writer’s hopes.

Here we have expert practitioners introducing a personal variation on what has come to be in this context a familiar signature tune – respect for the Author’s positive face by a positive acknowledgment of his/her contribution. The fact that the Readers in question feel sufficiently confident to play variations on this theme suggests that they take the reading public’s recognition of such ‘stability’ as given, which allows them the freedom to introduce a ‘change’ without jeopardizing the reading public’s cooperation or coparticipation in the reader/writer interaction.

Taking the 20 examples of the performance of Move 1 (RR and AR texts) discussed in 6.2. and the 2 alternative RR versions discussed in 6.2.2., we suggest that we have a body of evidence pointing to the fact that Readers and Authors discern sufficient perceivable regularities of lexical selection and social intention to allow us to attribute the epithet ‘generic’ to this opening move which acknowledges another’s contribution positively.

6.2.3. Symmetry of politeness acknowledgments

With the 10 Readers and 10 Authors discussed in 6.2. acknowledging positively a trigger text, the question arises as to whether these acknowledgments are symmetrical. Is politeness from a Reacting Reader reciprocated in kind by the Responding Author? In 8 of the 10 cases, an opening politeness marker was met with an answering one. But while there was a near *numerical* symmetry here, the *intensity*

of the politeness was not necessarily symmetrical in these 8 cases. For example, RR1 which opens with the polite but somewhat abrupt:

RR1 Joy Reid's (article title) offers some constructive advice.....

is paired with the much more generous:

AR1 I am grateful to those Quarterly readers who contacted me about my article. I especially appreciate the time and energy Chris Hall spent responding to my article. The satisfaction of writing an article is expanded by discussion with others.

The asymmetrical intensity of politeness above can appear with the polarities reversed. That is to say that, although the somewhat cool RR above is met with a more fulsome AR, the opposite can also be true, as in RR3 and AR3:

RR3 I read B. Kumaravadivelu's article... with great interest and appreciation.....The article is enlightening as well as thought provoking.

is paired with the somewhat perfunctory:

AR3 I thank Dilin Liu for a critical reading of my article.

6.2.4. Move 1 postscript

But whether intense or perfunctory, symmetrical or asymmetrical, these positive acknowledgments cannot be taken as any kind of indicator of the tone and attitude that may follow in the later part of the exchanges. They would appear to be the 'mere bow' to face which Brown and Levinson (1987:62) see as being like 'a diplomatic declaration of good intentions'. Or put another way, these positive acknowledgments are, I suggest, more an issue of form rather than reliable guides to genuine feelings and as such have a claim to generic status.

6.3. Entry Move 2 Overviewing trigger text content

Before launching detailed analysis or discussion, 20 of the 30 texts chose to give some form of review of the preceding text i.e. the text which had triggered their commentary. In the case of the Reacting Reader, this was the original research article in *TESOL Quarterly*. In the case of the Responding Author, this was the commentary of the said Reacting Reader. Although providing 'Forum' readers with a review of comments made in trigger texts was a fairly high frequency entry move, in that nearly two thirds the texts performed it, there was no general consensus on how it was to be performed. We note a variety of approaches. Some favoured extended quotation-rich recapitulations of key points from the trigger text, which pagemarked issues to be raised later in the discussion. Others confined themselves to abridged, paraphrased descriptions of the trigger text's general content. (One adopted both approaches.)

Within the broad categories of quotation-rich reviews and abridged paraphrases we come upon some reviews which are neutral in reviewing past comment and others which seek to review and evaluate simultaneously.

6.3.1. Step 1 Creating quotation-rich reviews

Although a significant number of RR and AR texts review their trigger texts rather briefly (as we shall see later), some RR texts choose to do so in somewhat extended synoptic form. In its extended form, this move could be seen as having a twofold purpose. It usefully reminds the 'Forum' public of the gist (or the gist as interpreted by the Reacting Reader) of the original article, since the time lapse

between the appearance of the original article and the 'Forum' reaction can never be less than 6 months and in practice is often much more. Moreover, in highlighting certain points from trigger texts Reacting Readers are signalling issues which they may well be raising in the forthcoming debate.

In the richer version which we examine first, this action is performed with recourse to quoted phrases (and at times page references) from the original article. By dovetailing citations of a writer's own words into their reviews, commentators appear to be seeking to augment the credibility of these reviews. For this would appear to be passing information to the 'Forum' public with maximum fidelity to the cited writer's claims.

Illustrating such a quotation-rich approach are the following:

RR4 Peirce's central concern in her TESOL Quarterly article (Vol.29, No.1) is to contribute to an overcoming of the 'artificial distinctions [drawn] between the language learner and the language learning context' (p.10) and the 'arbitrary mapping of particular factors on either the individual or the social' (p.11). Her central argument is that "SLA theorists have not developed a comprehensive theory of social identity that integrates the language learner and the language learning context. Furthermore, they have not questioned how relations of power in the social world affect social interaction between second language learners and target language speakers" (p.12).

RR8 In her Forum commentary (Vol.31, No.4) Ruth Spack addresses an issue that is of concern to many in the field of TESOL – the relationship between what people share with other members of their groups and what they do not share; in other words, what is cultural and what is particular to an individual. Spack is critical of ESL/EFL teachers and researchers who label students as belonging to a particular cultural groups because "no one label can accurately capture [the students] heterogeneity" (p.765). Such labeling, she maintains, "can lead us to stigmatize, to generalize, and to make inaccurate predictions about what students are likely to do as a result of their language or cultural background" (p.765). She goes on to propose that "teachers and researchers need to view students as individuals, not as members of a cultural group" (p.772).

Quotation rich reviews occasionally appear in AR texts, too. Given the briefer nature of the RR text to which they are responding, their authors may foreshorten, in turn, the process:

AR8 Gayle Nelson believes that the word labeling in and of itself has a negative connotation, and so she contends that I stack the deck as I warn that using labels “can lead us to stigmatize, to generalize, and to make inaccurate predictions about what students are likely to do as a result of their language or cultural background” (p.765) She recommends instead what she considers to be “[m]ore neutral” terms: *classifying* or *categorizing*.

Brief though it may be, such a move in AR texts (as in RR texts) pinpoints the discussion arena which the Author has selected.

An RR text demanding rather more discussion is RR7 which is unique in performing both Step 1 & 2 (discussed in the following section). It opens with a rhetorical question which keys-in the debate to come:

RR7 Is it appropriate, even ethical, for ESL/EFL writing teachers to focus on important, comprehensive course themes like peace education, environmental concerns, conflict resolution, literature, or critical thinking in their writing classes?...

Initially, the Reacting Reader appears to be opting for creating an abridged paraphrase (Step 2) of the trigger text:

Silva argues that ESL writers need to be respected by their ESL writing teachers in four important ways. Students should be (a) understood as student writers, (b) provided suitable learning contexts, (c) provided appropriate instruction, and (d) evaluated fairly.

After signaling dissent with the third point, the Reacting Reader goes on to create an additional review of the text, this time of a quotation-rich nature (Step 1) :

He calls writing courses with comprehensive themes like peace education “bait-and-switch scams” that may present students enrolled in an ESL writing course with “interesting and important yet inappropriate topics” (p.361) that may control or become the curriculum. He directs his criticism at a wide variety of popular comprehensive themes for writing courses, such as peace education, conflict resolution, environmental concerns, literature, critical thinking, cultural studies, and so on. In his view teachers should focus the content of their ESL writing courses “primarily if not exclusively” on teaching writing, particularly on what he calls “rhetorical, linguistic, conventional, and strategic issues” (p.361). As for

selecting specific topics about which to write, he asserts that students should have freedom to choose their own, either individually or in groups: "It seems to me most reasonable and motivating to have students (individually or as a group) choose their own topics, those in which they have a sincere interest and some intellectual and emotional investment" (pp.361-362)

Although all four writers show an approach to their text review which favours quoted phrases and page references – and which *suggests* scholarly objectivity - we see on closer examination that only RR4, RR8 and AR8 have any real claim to setting out to review without bias or evaluation. In those three texts Readers mediate neutrally between the Author's article and the 'Forum' public. In RR4 there are no reporting verbs at all (often a key indicator of a writer's stance) (Hyland 2002, Hunston 1993) and such as exist in RR8 – 'address' and 'maintain' – avoid attitudinal slanting. AR8's 'believes' is glossed by Hyland (2002:120) as belonging to the 'tentative' grouping of such verbs and the following 'contends' and 'recommends' seem focused on outlining the Reader's stance rather than evaluating it.

This evaluation-free approach, however, is not the one adopted in RR7. The opening rhetorical flourish might seem to be trying to use normal respect for peace education, conflict resolution, literature and other such unexceptionable subjects to distance us from Tony Silva. Tony Silva, we learn, if we read his own article, is not against any of these topics, only against them *being imposed* on students as subjects for writing courses, a fact admittedly conceded by the writer himself in his final quotation from the text. Going again to Silva's text we see that RR7 omits the final line from the list of topics quoted earlier. Silva's unease is caused not so much by the topics themselves as by writing courses being absorbed by such subjects so that they

‘use writing merely as an add-on or reinforcement activity.’ RR7 indicates that Silva calls comprehensive courses with themes such as peace education ‘bait-and-switch scams’. This is not strictly true, as we learn if we take time to read the article. RR7 would have us believe that, for Silva, a course with the theme of peace education equates with a ‘scam’. What Silva actually says is that if students enroll for courses with names like Introductory Writing or Freshman Composition it is reasonable for them to expect that the primary focus will be on writing and that the writing itself will not be an ‘add-on or reinforcement activity’ to some other topic. The ‘bait-and-switch scam’ epithet is applied to any course with a misleading course title and does not constitute an attack on courses structured around peace education *per se*.

I have taken time over this point since it illustrates a bifurcation of approach at this stage in the textualisation process of reviewing past comment. RR4 and RR8 have opted for an extended quotation-rich neutral review (AR8 for a briefer but similar format); RR7 has also chosen a detailed quotation-rich review whose use of the original writer’s words might *appear* to be passing on information objectively but this text has manipulated or suppressed citations in a way that renders the information contained in these citations less than faithful to the writer’s original comments and intentions. Undermining this ‘objectivity’ is the Reacting Reader’s rather unsubtle mediation between Author and ‘Forum’ public. In other words, the evaluative process is already under way under the guise of an outline of the main thrust of the original article. It must be said that this ‘loading of the dice’ is far from being standard practice in this type of text, but evaluative mediation between a trigger text

and the 'Forum' public by a writer is not unknown, as we shall see later, when reviewing past comments. It must be said, however, that this mediation is usually less covertly manipulated than it is in RR7 and can be overtly positive as well as negative.

A more transparent example of evaluative mediation in a quotation rich review may be found in RR9

RR9 Ruth Spack claims in her *TESOL Quarterly* Forum commentary (Vol.31, No. 4) that "using labels" for [ESL] students "can lead us to stigmatize, to generalize, and to make inaccurate predictions about what students are likely to do as a result of their language or cultural background"(p.765). This statement is unarguable ...

A more equivocal case may be found in AR6:

AR6 In her response, Amy Schlessman denies that there is a distinction between theory and practice, arguing instead that we as L2 teacher educators should "dissolve the issue of separation of ideas and things" and "stop separating theory and practice."

Here the reporting verb 'denies' is glossed by Hyland (2002:121) among reporting verbs which 'counter' i.e. which testify to the writer's 'reservations or objections to the correctness of the reported message.' In other words, AR6 is already evaluating negatively the upcoming comments. Turning to the OED, however, we see that as well as defining 'deny' as 'to contradict or gainsay', it also offers the less conflictual definition of 'to say "no" to a statement', thus opening the way to suggesting that the Author could simply be outlining the Reader's position rather than alerting us to reservations or objections to this position.

What is important for this study is that all of the above writers share an awareness of the appropriateness of a quotation-rich review (extended or otherwise) of past comment for presenting themselves as a credible authority to the 'Forum'

public. Put another way, this awareness of the appropriateness of such a move – subverted though it may be on one occasion – at such a point indicates that expert practitioners – be they neutral or evaluative in intention, positive or hostile in attitude – recognizes its generic quality.

It should be noted that while this move which reviews trigger texts' contents was found in nearly two thirds of the texts examined, this quotation-rich version of it discussed above produced 6 examples.

The abridged paraphrase version of Entry Move 2 was a more popular choice and, like the quotation-rich version, shares a similar divide between objectivity and evaluation.

6.3.2. Step 2 Creating abridged paraphrases

Taking up a similar stance to RR4 and RR8 i.e. outlining neutrally the main thrust of the trigger text, but this time without recourse to extended textual citations or extended summary, were other RR and AR texts

Examples of this in RR texts include:

RR14 The authors have confronted the critical task of trying to integrate new developments in classroom assessment with existing practices, and they offer an extensive bibliography for readers to refer to.

RR10 It [the article] was a sequel to her earlier article on the same children published in 1996. Centrally featured in both articles are Lave and Wenger's (1991) notions of community of practice and legitimate peripheral participation (LPP).

And in AR texts, too, we find paraphrased versions:

AR1 Chris Hall's response focuses on three ideas (personalized here for the sake of discussion:

- that I overstate the ability of research to intimidate ESL teachers

- that I believe expressivists are wholly responsible for all appropriation of student text, and
- that I am bent upon resurrecting and continuing the process/product split.

AR3 His concerns are that (a) we should stop searching for better and newer methods and (b) my strategic framework is not an alternative to method.

AR4 It is clear that Price does not support this school of post structuralist theory because he has questioned whether his reading of my article [article title] is a valid one.

AR5 In her discussion of my comments on the emotional impact of development of a new value set, Hilder questions whether or not I could slip in and out of this new set of values.

AR10 In Kanno's discussion of the community-of-practice perspective that I have used to understand the data I report in these two articles, I believe she is primarily concerned about her notion of *legitimate peripheral participation* (LPP) as proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991). Her objection is, as I understand it, that LPP does not sufficiently recognize the structural barriers to the participation of minority language background students in school activities.

AR13 Like Ewald, I have indeed searched, and continue to search, the critical-alternative-radical pedagogical literature for concrete suggestions concerning classroom practice, and, like, her, I would like to see more accounts of practice.

The above outline-overviews of the comments of Reacting Readers by Responding Authors manifest certain similarities to the behaviour of Authors in Entry Move 1. In Entry Move 1, we remember, they chose to award themselves an 'out' from any potentially face-threatening act of Reader criticism by glossing their comments as an 'opportunity'. Here, certain terms and expressions which *could be* glossed as contentious such as:

-that I overstate the ability of research
-that I am bent upon resurrecting
-my strategic framework is not an alternative to method
-Hilder questions..
- Her objection is.....

- are here mediated neutrally i.e. integrated without evaluative comment by Authors into the objective review framework which they have set up, as if to suggest that their detachment is such that views which do not coincide entirely with their own perspectives are wholly valid and non-threatening. In this way, Authors forward the

business of helping build up their image as objective scholars and thus quietly advance their cause in the quest to be seen as a 'Primary Knower'.

Such neutrally mediated paraphrases were the most common form of reviewing trigger text content and, as can be seen above, outnumber instances of quotation rich reviews.

In extended, quotation-rich reviews we saw both objective and evaluative versions of Move 2 in RR and AR texts alike. The same is true in these paraphrased versions. Turning from the objective versions above to those with evaluative indicators, we note six examples, four positive, two negative:

RR5 Her emphasis on the complicated nature of transfer and on the influence of unconscious assumptions about the meaning of literacy, how literacy should be learned, and which "qualities of self" (p.687) are displayed in literacy is very welcome in a field where often students and teachers hope for the simple answer.

RR6 She incorporates case-based methods of teaching, professional development schools, and portfolio assessment through a revised definition of the role of theory in L2 teacher education. Her commentary represents a move to make L2 teacher education programs more meaningful to prospective teachers.

RR12 To begin, Hamp-Lyons extrapolates most of her observations on TOEFL preparation materials from a rather small and decidedly unrepresentative sample of five TOEFL texts "selected at random" in 1996 from "the market" (p.331) (presumably English-only books on the North American market, for the texts themselves remain uncited). Based upon this haphazard sample, she draws sweeping conclusions about the state of TOEFL preparation materials worldwide.

RR13 Their reflective and detailed report of experiences in a teacher education classroom contributes to the collective knowledge...Despite the proliferation of discussion regarding critical pedagogy and S/FL classrooms, few authors have suggested what it might look like fleshed out in an actual classroom.

AR12 Their response is important, first, because it continues the airing of a very important issue; second, because they provide citations to lead interested readers to welcome evidence that not all Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) textbooks are as problematic as those I analyzed.

AR9 In my Forum article, I challenge Carson's statements about education in Asia because of her misreading of the sources from which she draws her information. I call Carson's scholarship "selective" in the sense that she ignores a wealth of evidence in a book she cites – evidence that would challenge the limited view of education in China that she herself presents.

Responding Authors (with the above two exception) showed little interest in evaluative abridged paraphrases. Why? Given the briefer nature of the AR text and its close proximity to the RR text itself, Authors seemed to prefer to get on with arguing their case without further ado and to advance to evaluation itself without recourse to a preliminary evaluative platform.

Whenever evaluation appeared in move 2, it usually indicated the writer's stance (either positive or negative) with regard to certain information. This, in terms of Biber and Finnegan (1989) and Conrad and Biber (2000), might be described as revealing *attitudinal* stance. In RR11, however, we encounter an abridged overview evaluating somewhat differently:

RR11 In the light of the controversy created by the Oakland School Board's December 1996 Ebonics resolution, Smitherman's choice of Oakland to illustrate her premise that language is the major factor in the failure of Ebonics-speaking students was to be expected.

Here we have a rare example in these texts of evaluation manifesting *epistemic* stance, in Conrad and Biber's terms (2000), in that it draws attention to the likelihood of the event. The rarity of this occurrence underlines the dominant prevalence of attitudinal stance in evaluation in this section of the texts.

6.3.3. Move 2 postscript

In this section, 11 of the 15 RR texts and 10 of the 15AR texts saw the need for some form of review of trigger text content. A higher frequency than that encountered in the RR texts might perhaps have been expected since the RR text has the task of familiarising the 'Forum' public with the initial *TESOL Quarterly*

article, a task rendered largely unnecessary for the AR text, given its proximity to this content review. However, 10 of the 15 AR texts still felt the need for some form of ‘gathering’ move before launching detailed discussion. Why should this be? The answer comes perhaps in AR 7 where Tony Silva, in the place where we might expect this particular move i.e. after acknowledging positively the Reader’s contribution and before getting down to his main discussion, explains :

I will quote Professor Jones’ text verbatim and insert my comments directly thereafter. Also, I will identify the portions of Professor Jones’ critique to which I am responding by italicizing them. I admit this admittedly unorthodox mode of response because I have reservations about many of Professor Jones’ assertions and want to address them in context in an attempt to make my response as fair, clear and unambiguous as possible.

What, we wonder, might Silva consider ‘orthodox’ behaviour at this point? Might it not be one of the above variants we have been describing? A ‘gathering’ platform which overviews past comment before commencing discussion rather than his own signalled ‘point-by-point approach’? His next comment is even more compelling:

I beg the reader’s indulgence of this genre bending.

Throughout this thesis we are attempting to establish if these intertextual critical exchanges are indeed a genre. Professor Silva, by implication, seems to think they are. He apparently feels the move he is presently making requires some explanation for its unorthodoxy, as if he were departing from some anticipated social and linguistic regularity performed by expert practitioners at such a point in such a text. We suggest that he is not only identifying this exchange as part of a genre but identifying his present particular move in this genre as a *departure* from a more usual one here - that perhaps of some form of review of trigger text content prior to

launching detailed analysis and discussion. Professor Silva's good manners in begging indulgence for this lapse might well suggest that he at least sees the anticipated occurrence of this missing move as generic and its absence as a form of 'genre bending'. We are reminded again of Bazerman (1994:82):

Eventually the genres sediment into forms so expected that readers are surprised or even uncooperative if a standard perception of the situation is not met by an utterance of the expected form.

Silva seems to share this perception and seeks to defuse what he presumes will be surprise at his non-respect of what he sees as generic norms with a graceful comment.

But this drawing attention to unorthodoxy is more than oblique evidence of a discourse community's supposed orthodoxy. It reminds us that if indeed we are dealing with a genre, we would do well to think of it in Schryer's phrase (1993:200) as sites which are merely 'stabilized-for-now'. Although we saw a widespread performance of this move, it took various forms and one practitioner self-consciously drew attention to its non-performance, underlining the fact that genres are not entirely stable and are capable of being reshaped 'by the incremental adaptations of routine users' (Freedman and Medway, 1994:200.)

6.4. Entry Move 3 Priming reply

As we move deeper into these intertextual critical exchanges, we note a growing diversity of action appearing. Two thirds of the texts performed Entry Move 1, more than two thirds of texts performed Entry Move 2, but although still quite a

popular move (15 instances), Entry Move 3 – priming reply– was subject to multiple variants and was more popular in RR texts (11 instances) than in AR texts (4 instances). These tactical variants will be discussed under the term ‘steps’, as defined in Chapter 5.

Reply priming is a vital entry move for helping the reader anticipate the behaviour of the upcoming text. It helps him/her situate either the attitude that the writer is going to take or the directional thrust of the text which will follow.

The most popular choice was to signal dissent. But as we shall see this dissent was often obliquely worded and varied in several ways.

6.4.1. Step 1A Signalling generalized dissent (with concession marker)

Nine performances signalling dissent were preceded by concessive comments (italicized). Three of these instances expressed dissent in generalized language:

RR1 *Although I find much of her advice reasonable and am pleasantly surprised that we share much in common about providing honest and constructive feedback to our students,* her article invites some further comment.

RR14 *Moreover, the opening discussion on the positive characteristics of alternative assessments and reliability issues augured well, as did the distinction made between ‘alternative assessments’ and ‘alternatives in assessments’.* Looking beyond these contributions, I was disappointed with several aspects of the authors’ treatment of assessment for language teachers..

RR15 *I recognize that it is a discourse tradition to carve out a research space for oneself by showing what others’ work has not done and how one’s work fills in that gap. It is clear that Ibrahim is doing just that in discussing my work,* but he has done so both by including factual inaccuracies and misrepresenting my study’s purposes and research questions.

6.4.2. Step 1B Signalling generalized dissent (without concession marker)

In addition to the examples of generalized dissent performed above with concession markers, generalized dissent without a revisiting of balancing positive comments also existed:

RR2 Unfortunately, we found both conceptual and methodological problems that rendered such possibilities moot. We also discovered some statements that could be misleading to future researchers and to consumers of research.

AR14 But more seriously, many of his assertions were simply wrong.

The language of these generalized utterances of dissent (with or without concession markers) tends to share a certain unspecificity. Far from pinpointing and denying a specific claim, these examples prefer to express dissent obliquely by criticizing faults writers found in the discourse act itself in a fairly general way. For all the positive achievement (perhaps, but not necessarily, noted already), these texts talk of the need for ‘some further comment’ or find ‘conceptual and methodological problems’, ‘some statements’ and ‘several aspects’ that cannot be left unchallenged by self-respecting academics and while ‘many of the assertions’ of one writer were ‘simply wrong’, the nature of the error was left unspecified. The as-yet-to-be-detailed shortcomings are being labeled for future unpacking, the text implies, and recall not only Winter’s work (1977, 1979) on lexical anticipation, but also Hoey’s (1983, 2001) comments on how general-particular relationships organize text, for in the upcoming sentences the implications of ‘sub-technical nouns’ (Bolivar 1994:71) such as ‘problems’, ‘aspects’, ‘inaccuracies’ etc. will be explored to lead us from general

statements of inadequacy to more particularized utterances which will shape the following stretch of discourse. (Also evoked here is Tadros' (1981, 1994) idea of Enumeration, one of her categories of Prediction. For although no actual numbers are invoked she reminds us that

‘Numeral’ can be...inexact, such as *a few, several, a number of...*)

Even without concessive comments, such an approach shows a certain respect (admittedly only temporary here) for the author's face by avoiding immediate direct denial of any specific claims. Furthermore, such an approach leaves writers freedom of manoeuvre in structuring the upcoming discussion. They are not setting an agenda which limits them to justifying denials of a self-selected, enumerated sequence of points, but rather are adopting an approach which frees them to address and comment on as many or as few of the ‘problems’, ‘aspects’, ‘inaccuracies’ and ‘statements’ as they wish in whatever order they see fit.

Such is not the case with those texts which choose to signal particularized denials rather than generalized criticisms.

6.4.3. Step 2 Signalling particularized dissent (with concession marker)

In the above realizations of Step 1 we noted the non-specific nature of the dissent expressed, whether with or without a concession marker. In this section we look at realizations which choose to examine dissent in more detail at this preliminary stage. It was my original intention here to divide this step, as I divided the preceding one, into texts with and texts without a concession marker. In the event, however, it was noted that particularized dissent was always performed *with* a concession marker.

RR3 *Although I applaud the author's fresh look at the conventional notion of method, and value his informative discussion of the macro-strategies for TOEFL*, I have strong reservations concerning his assumption about the futility/demise of the search for better methods and his proposal of a strategic framework as an 'alternative to method' (p.29)

RR7 *Of course, I agree with much of what he writes*. I respectfully disagree, however, with most of what he argues for under the rubric of his third point, that ESL writers should be provided with appropriate instruction. The issue here is how to interpret the term appropriate instruction. In my view, his interpretation is too narrow and biased to be helpful.

RR9 *This statement is unarguable because, once a category has been recognized, the potential for misuse of the category's name – its label – is always there*. However, it does not follow, as Spack seems to think, that labeling in and of itself constitutes a problem, and herein lies the relevant question for ESL/EFL teachers: What should we know about the language and cultural backgrounds of the students we teach?

RR10 I argue that *in general the community-of-practice can help embed the discussion of language minority students' L2 in its sociocultural/political context and is therefore a positive addition to the field*. But I argue against the idea of describing language minority students' membership in schools as LPP.

RR11 Unfortunately, *although she holds Oakland up as an example of a system in which African American students are "experiencing a severe educational crisis" (p.140)*, Smitherman apparently did not investigate conditions in Oakland, as demonstrated by her use of a statistical inaccuracy to bolster her premise. Specifically, Smitherman states that "71% of Oakland's black students are tracked in special education or learning disabilities-type programs" (p.140).

RR13 *Fostering the development of a critical pedagogy in future teachers is an inspiring and thought provoking challenge*, but it is perhaps also misleading because of the lack of guidance on practical issues associated with critical pedagogy.

Gone here from the dissent is vague talk of ‘some further comment’, ‘some statements’ and ‘several aspects’ requiring to be examined. Specific claims are denied:

RR3 I have strong reservations concerning his assumption about the futility/demise of the search for better methods and his proposal of a strategic framework as an ‘alternative to method’ (p.29)

RR7 I respectfully disagree with most of what he argues for under the rubric of his third point, that ESL should be provided with appropriate instruction....

RR11 Smitherman apparently did not investigate conditions in Oakland as demonstrated by her use of a statistical inaccuracy to bolster her premise. Specifically, Smitherman states that “71% of Oakland’s black students are tracked in special education or learning disabilities-type programs” (p.140).

Not only is the dissent more particularized and tied to specific claims but the language itself is sharper:

...it does not follow, as Spack seems to think...

..I find it necessary to question again...and this time to interrogate her claim...

...I have strong reservations..

I respectfully disagree with most of what he argues for under the rubric of his third point..

Smitherman apparently did not investigate conditions

In the texts registering generalized dissent we noted somewhat unfocused criticism of the discourse act itself e.g. ‘conceptual and methodological problems’ etc. Here we have sharply focused points of issue – *under the rubric of his third point that..., Smitherman states that* “71% of Oakland’s black students.. With text citations and page numbers making appearances here and adding to the precision of the charges, we are reminded of those quotation-rich reviews of trigger text content examined under Entry Move 2. Here, again, the writer is positioning him/herself as an

authoritative critic, one faithful to the text s/he is criticizing and arguing a closely focused denial of past claims which will shape the structure of the upcoming text.

In the drive to be seen as 'Primary Knower' in the eyes of the 'Forum' readers we note here two distinct approaches to creating authorial personae in these opening stages. On the one hand we have writer as lofty, even-handed evaluator of the discourse in general, on the other we have writer as detail-driven analyst of specificities of scholarship.

Before leaving this step we add the following comment on concession. Dissent without a concession marker was performed only twice. In all other cases, Readers and Authors alike favoured some form of concession when dissenting at this point in the text. We have already discussed the probable rationale behind this behaviour earlier in this chapter i.e. the mitigation of potentially face-threatening acts.

But as well as being a gesture to the positive face of hearers and the veracity of their claims, concession as seen by Thompson and Zhou (2000:130) may well perform another useful function for the writer here:

...we do not normally find it necessary to proclaim explicitly the truth value of a proposition unless that value is in some way in question.

In other words, while seeming to be an act of threat-mitigation, concession can also be seen as

...accepting the truth of a proposition and in a way calling it into question in relation to the following dominant assertion. (2000:130)

We shall return in more detail to the potentially destabilizing force of concession in Chapter 7 where it plays a critical role in the performance of a central act of negation for which this step is a dress-rehearsal.

6.4.4. Step 3 Signalling direction

This, it must be said at the outset, was a low-frequency step (4 instances) and one found in AR (3) rather than RR (1) texts. Why should this be? One possible answer is that when Reacting Readers performed the fairly common entry move of reviewing trigger text content – whether in quotation-rich version or abridged paraphrase – they were already signalling obliquely the ground the text was likely to visit. This move, we remember, was less common in AR texts and this variant on it might, therefore, be seen as a variant substitute for entry move 2 which, we saw, helped the ‘Forum’ public anticipate the direction the text would take. In entry move 2 this direction was intimated by *reviewing* trigger text; in this step 3 of entry move 3 this direction was heralded by *previewing* action :

AR2 I will focus on three main points with reference to the content of my report.

AR5 I would like to elaborate on a few of the questions she raises.

AR7 Thus, I have decided to cast my response as a dialogue, both figuratively and literally. That is, I will quote Professor Jones’ text verbatim and insert my comments directly thereafter. Also, I will identify the portions of Professor Jones’ critique to which I am responding by italicizing them.

This anticipated future direction is underlined by the 3 instances of ‘will’ and 1 of ‘would like to’ where the writers appear to be helping to guide the ‘Forum’ public through the upcoming terrain, thus promoting the idea of the writer as well-mannered, considerate and in a position to further understanding. Although in the

single example of a RR text which uses this kind of metalanguage we do not note future tenses as such, the intention is to describe for the “Forum’ public the kind of text they can expect to encounter:

RR12 This article is form of argumentative dialectic to Liz Hamp-Lyons’ Forum commentary (Vol.32, No.2).... It is argumentative because..... It is dialectical because.....

Whether by looking backward or forward, there would appear to be a strong desire in entry move 2 and step 3 of entry move 3 to orientate the reading public to the contours of the road ahead.

6.4.5 Move 3 postscript

Although this is a move centred on expressing dissent, a vital component of any discussion of this move is the idea of politeness. This may suggest itself in the echo of Entry Move 1 which we see in the concessive remarks preceding criticism. Myers (1989 :6), talking of academic claims and denials of claims, suggests that

‘acts of claiming and denying claims will usually be redressed (in Brown and Levinson’s term) with some sort of device to make them more polite.... That is, the texts themselves show that the authors are aware of the FTAs. These devices are not always specific words or phrases that signal politeness: one could not find them by searching for certain tokens. Rather, politeness is ‘implicated by the semantic structure of the whole utterance’ (Brown and Levinson 1987:22)

Here we can see that Myers claim should perhaps be extended from specific claims and denials to generalized expressions of criticism as well. We see, too, the strength of his ‘usually’, for most, *but not all*, of these expressions of dissent were preceded by some form of concessionary comment intended to neutralize face threatening acts. (These unmitigated acts of dissent by authors represent the feature of

these intertextual critical exchanges which most marks them out from research articles.) Demonstrated, too, was the aptness of Myers' comment on non-specificity of the devices for expressing politeness.

Even in those expressions of dissent where no face-saving concession markers were included, the noted vagueness of a considerable part of the language used to perform the expression of dissent helped neutralize any potential offence. In only two cases of the performance of this move were there wholly unmitigated criticisms.

Politeness, too, was present in the final step which signalled direction. Here, however, the politeness was directed not at other writers, but more at the reading public by helping them orientate themselves to the path of the discourse ahead.

All in all, this entry move indicates the writer's appreciation of the need to combine the action of reply priming with textual courtesy (in a variety of guises) before settling down to evaluate content in detail. By prefacing this evaluation by a show of good manners to other practitioners and a demonstration of clear guidance to the reading public, the writer is well-positioned for a sympathetic hearing of the forthcoming evaluative reply from which stems his/her claim to be regarded as a Primary Knower.

6.5. Move 4 Establishing authority

This was a move which, in one variant or another, was favoured by both Readers and Authors in 16 texts.

This move normally came before the launching of a full discussion of the points in the trigger text which the writer wished to debate and which constitute the bulk of the text. The positioning of this move before the text's central evaluation section is perhaps no coincidence. For by establishing themselves firmly in the reading public's mind as people whose claim to commentate is patently credible and, thus, authoritative, they are seeking at an early stage of the evaluation to suggest their claim to ascendancy and, with it, their Primary Knower status.

The establishing of authority took at least 3 distinct forms. It was usually realized by one or more of the following steps.

- Reviewing the relevant literature
- Reporting field experience
- Cultivating reader complicity

6.5.1. Step 1 Reviewing literature

In realizing this step Readers outnumbered Authors 8 to 2. We should not perhaps be surprised by this ratio. Authors, we remember, have already published their views in *TESOL Quarterly*. These views, following conventional practice, are not slow to cite past authority in their bid to imbue their new knowledge claims with credibility. Their literature review has, as it were, already been published. The very fact, too, of having an article published in a refereed journal as prestigious as *TESOL*

Quarterly confers authority and in itself further boosts Authors' claims to be believed. Their work on the credibility front, so to speak, has already been completed.

Reacting Readers, on the other hand, still have this work to do if they are to appear in the eyes of the reading public as authoritative members of the linguistics discourse community, members who are not necessarily entirely supportive of the opinions of the published Author. Obliquely, they are answering the reading public's unspoken questions: 'Who are you and why should I place any credence in *your* opinions?'. Answer: 'I am someone who knows this field and its literature well.'

In opting for this authority-enhancing step, Readers adopted various approaches to their reviews.

RR1 well exemplifies an expanded version:

RR1 During the past few decades, the majority of research does not seem to me to obscure the distinction between giving constructive feedback and coopting a student's intellectual property. Take Sommers' (1982) work, for example, which Reid uses to introduce the term *appropriating*. The article has been widely reproduced and is familiar to ESL researchers. In fact, Robb, Ross and Shortreed (1986) in their empirical study of how feedback can affect editing tasks in a L2 context mention it favourably. After the unassuming introduction of the term, Sommers (1982) offers examples and discussion on the state of text commenting...I do not believe that research has intimidated a significant number of ESL teachers... Leki (1990), for example, mentions the problem of appropriation without noting an overreaction one way or the other. Her advice for dealing with a case of appropriation coincides with Greenhalgh's (1992) and does not suggest that we should be so irresponsible as to completely disengage ourselves from students' texts..

While RR1 takes care to integrate references to the literature into his line of argumentative thought (but without quoting from them directly), others such as RR2 take a very different approach. Here the references are strewn densely over the page and the reader is to deduce – somewhat obliquely – that the listed references will bear out the general argument of the Reader's text at this point:

RR2 In fact, with groups of students from junior high age through adulthood in many countries around the world, the SILL has proven highly valid. Its predictive and concurrent validity are demonstrated by strong relationships between the SILL on the one hand and language performance on the other (Bedell, 1993; Boraie, Kassabgy, & Oxford, 1994; Dreyer, 1992; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Green, 1992; Mullins, 1992; Oh, 1992; Oxford, 1986; Oxford & Burry, 1992; Oxford & Burry-Stock, in press; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Phillips, 1991; Watanabe, 1990; Wildner-Bassett, 1992). Moreover, it has very high reliability with internal consistency coefficients in the .90s (see summaries of reliability studies in Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Burry, 1993; Oxford & Burry-Stock, in press).

Some might prefer to label this as literature listing rather than literature reviewing, but the aim here is clearly the same as that of RR1: to preface the upcoming argument with credentials of authority based on knowledge of the relevant literature.

But, remembering in RR2 that the Reacting Readers are called Rebecca L. Oxford and John M. Green, what are we to make of the fact that 7 out of the 14 references include at least one of their names? This is perhaps an even more vigorous attempt to gain ascendancy, for not only are they saying that they are impressively familiar with numerous studies in this area, they are at the same time showing that they themselves *wrote* many of them. (The effect on the reading public might be difficult to gauge here, for although Oxford and Green have clearly established themselves as authoritative figures by citing numerous of their own works, their ‘authority’ is self-selected and might be interpreted as too self-serving to convince independently-minded members of the public.)

The other seven writers who chose to realize this literature review step all fall somewhere on a continuum between the above two positions.

Closest to RR1 are RR5 and RR3 :

RR5 She does not make it clear whether she feels she would be able to slip in and out of this value set, as Shen (1989) suggests he does. Too often, a surface style of U.S. academic writing is assumed, and as Leki (1992) points out, the message that most ESL students may have been receiving is that they should “conform superficially to the norms of the target community, not to worry about questioning those norms or thinking critically about them” (p.125). Leki suggests that the underlying assumption here is that “the student has *the right* to come away from the interaction with the target community unchanged” (p.125). Bell’s study, together with Shen’s (1989) article seem to imply that this is impossible. The understandable resistance of some students to creating or incorporating a new set of values is seen in an example in Ferris (1995) in which.

RR5 shares with RR1 the writer’s interweaving of literature references into the text. Although fewer in number in the opening sections when compared with other texts, the references are at times cited verbatim and page numbers given, thus appearing to emphasize the depth rather than necessarily the range of familiarity. As we read on, however, we note that this impression of restricted range is dispelled. For more literature references are integrated throughout the text, wherever the writer feels them necessary e.g. (*Rodby 1992, Reid 1994, Heath 1992, Johns 1994, Bateson 1972*) and where they contribute tellingly to the flow of her argument. This discreet signaling of field knowledge is in marked contrast to the more flagrant use of references in RR2 and marks a very different approach to winning over the reading public.

Like RR5, RR3 also chooses to establish authority by referring to a relatively restricted list of published scholars but from whom he chooses to quote verbatim (with page references), thus demonstrating considerable in-depth knowledge not only of their thinking but also of their texts:

RR3 Celce-Murcia and McIntosh (1979), for example, clearly differentiate the two when they write that ESOL teachers should have ‘the knowledge of teaching methods, background on and strategies for teaching the language skills’ (p.ix). That is, teachers will

need both methods and strategies to successfully accomplish their instructional work in class. Methods, according to many experts (e.g. Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Richards & Rodgers, 1986), involve theories about language and teaching, procedures, and techniques. Krashen & Terrell (1983), for example, even equate methods with techniques: "The series method advocated by Francis Gouin was perhaps the best known *technique* [emphasis added] used by psychological methodologists" (p.10).

Texts closest to the intensive listing approach of RR2 which we discussed earlier include the following:

RR13 Current work on alternative pedagogies addresses such topics as social identity and voice (Peirce, 1995), power (Auerbach, 1993; Pennycook, 1989), the morality of teaching (Jackson, Boostrom & Hansen, 1993; Johnston, Juhz, Marken & Ruiz, 1998), (participatory) action research (Auerbach, 1994; Crookes, 1993,1998), and the development of a critical pedagogical approach to research and teaching (see Crawford, 1978; Crawford-Lange, 1981; Pennycook, 1994).

Less extreme in density of references, however, is RR6:

RR6 Dewey (1916/1966; Ratner,1939) and other American pragmatists addressed the problem of theory/practice dualism early in the 20th century. Their work has recently come to fruition in the work of some of the postmodern writers, often members of traditionally underrepresented groups (Warhime, 1993), in search of more extensive acceptance of the socially constructed nature of education as a quintessential teaching and learning device. By using the word *Experience* with a capital E, Dewey (1938/1963) focuses attention on education as pervasive in human meaning.....

Many writers for the *TESOL Quarterly* have discussed other pitfalls of dichotomies (Clarke, 1994) and the relationship of theory and practice (Peirce, 1995,1996; Price, 1996; Schenke,1996). Clarke did a service to our profession by pointing out that the 'distinction between theory and practice in professional and public discourse is generally dysfunctional for teachers' (p.9)

We note in passing that RR6, despite opting for a tendency towards the end for the 'listing' approach, does in fact unpack *one* reference by giving a direct quotation and page number. Going even further than RR6 in seeking to combine the two approaches is RR8:

RR8 In using the term *labeling*, Spack has chosen a term that in American English has negative connotations when applied to people. More neutral terms for the same phenomenon

are *classifying* and *categorizing*, the ordering or arrangement of phenomena “based on observable or inferred properties” (Sokal, 1977, p.187) Classifying is necessary because the “world consists of a virtually infinite number of discriminably different stimuli” (Rosch, 1977, p.212) and classifying helps us make order of and process those stimuli. It “cannot be avoided” and is “necessary for an orderly life” (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984, p.84).

According to Sokal (1977), the process of classifying dates back to before the evolution of human beings: {6 line Sokal quotation} Thus the process of classification is not merely one of numerous cognitive processes; it is one of the most fundamental ones. Without the ability to classify, our ancestors would not have known, for example, what was dangerous, friendly, benign, edible, or poisonous. Lenneberg (1967) argues that classification is, in fact, the most basic cognitive process.

The fundamental nature of classifying or categorizing has been well documented (e.g. Brislin, 1981; Clark & Clark, 1977; Hurford & Heasley, 1983; Kassin, 1995; Myers, 1996; Nelson, 1977; Rosch, 1977).

Similar to the above is RR10, in which unpacking and listing go hand in hand:

RR10 Erickson and Shultz (1981) point out that “the commonsense view of educational practice, of what is most important to pay attention to in and about schools, has left little room indeed for the points of view of the very persons who are the first-level consumers of educational services” (p.481).....

My second point, related to the first, is that because of the community-of-practice perspective equates learning to “the identity-making life projects of participants in communities of practice” (Lave, 1996, p.157), it opens up a venue for addressing the relationship between students’ sociocultural experiences and their language acquisition. Although ESL students’ language development has traditionally been associated with academic achievement, several recent studies (Cummins, 1996; Harklau, 1994; Kanno & Applebaum, 1995; McKay & Wong, 1996) have found that negotiating identities....also has a strong impact on students’ English acquisition.

Like RR5 discussed earlier, we note (when we read on) that the writer of RR10 above subsequently follows the opening salvo of authority with other names which integrate discreetly into the later text, where their presence interweaves usefully with the writer’s line of argument.

The much rarer examples of literature reviewing from a Responding Author follow the combined unpacking and listing approach, albeit in a comparatively brief format.

AR3 Scholars in education have been drawing our attention to the methods fetish for quite some time (see Bartolome, 1994 for a recent argument). In fact, they have called for an “antimethods pedagogy that refuses to be enslaved by the rigidity of models and methodological paradigms” (Macedo, 1994, p.8)

..... The push to go beyond the boundaries of method is evident in several recent publications meant for graduate students, practicing teachers, and teacher educators (e.g. Brown, 1994; Freeman & Cornwell, 1993; Richards & Lockhart, 1994).

AR13 Many pedagogies are built upon critiques of society or critical social theories – not only Paul Freire’s socialist (and Marxist and Catholic) critique but other long-standing leftist critiques, such as the anarchist critique that underlies many free schools (Mercogliano, 1998; Shotton, 1993; Smith, 1983), the green critique (e.g. Randle, 1989), the gender-based critiques that lead to feminist pedagogy (e.g. Sattler, 1997) and queer theory (e.g. Pinar, 1998).

Looking beyond the references cited in this step alone, we see that, throughout the text as a whole, the *number* of references cited by Readers and Authors provided some interesting if perhaps predictable variation. Below is table of the number of references per text.

Authority citations in

RR texts		AR texts	
RR1	14	AR1	00
RR2	16	AR2	04
RR3	03	AR3	06
RR4	05	AR4	05
RR5	08	AR5	07
RR6	12	AR6	05
RR7	07	AR7	00
RR8	06	AR8	07
RR9	13	AR9	18
RR10	19	AR10	04
RR11	00	AR11	02
RR12	05	AR12	08
RR13	12	AR13	41
RR14	04	AR14	02
RR15	01	AR15	06
Average:	9	Average:	7.6

Table 2. Frequency of references by Readers and Authors

It emerges quite clearly that, by and large, the recourse to authority is more frequently made in RR texts. If we remove the unusually high number of references made at the end of AR13, the average for RR texts is 9 per text and for AR texts the

average is 5. (With AR13 included the respective averages are 9 and 7.6) This should perhaps not surprise us unduly given the differences in the roles of Readers and Authors here.

Authors have already made their mark by being published in *TESOL Quarterly*. Readers, on the other hand, are newcomers to the debate, intervening usually to take issue with points raised in the TQ article. To have their claims/comments accepted, it is necessary for them to establish their credentials in the eyes of the TQ reading public. Partly this is done by arguing their case cogently; partly it is done by showing that their cogently argued case is sustained by previously published authority. A substantial list points to them having a fair claim to knowledgeable insider status and as such Readers have a fair claim to be listened to. Authors, for their part, have already had work accepted for *TESOL Quarterly* which in itself brings considerable kudos and professional status. Called upon to respond to a critique, they do not need to strive so hard to establish their credentials or insider status. Accordingly, with the exception of the already mentioned AR13 (41 references) and AR9 (18 references), the number of references in every other AR text falls below that of the average for RR texts.

6.5.2. Step 2 Reporting field experience

While more than half of the Reacting Readers sought to establish their authority and credibility by means of some form of a literature review, only two

Responding Authors felt the need to do so. In Step 2 of Move 4 we see that, while it is a less popular step (5 instances), it is realized *only* by Responding Authors.

One explanation for this step being limited exclusively to Responding Authors might well be the fact that they may feel that their *TESOL Quarterly* article has already adequately demonstrated their academic credentials. Now they choose to field their professional ‘hands-on’ experience in a bid to boost their authority and assure ascendancy.

AR2 From an ethnographic perspective, I have immersed myself in the sociocultural context under study in that I have lived and worked in Japan for over 10 years and have taught Japanese learners of English in a variety of situations during that time. I have read their writings and listened to their discussions about learning and studying languages.

AR6 When I ask my MA TESOL students to read about a particular theory, I ask them to reflect on how it may or may not be relevant to their own L2 learning and teaching experiences and to consider the extent to which the theory is consistent with their beliefs about how L2s are learned and should be taught. I present them with a case and ask them to reflect on how the theory might broaden their understanding of the instructional dilemma embedded in the case.... I ask them to consider how their students might be experiencing these activities and to examine the possible consequences of such activities for their students’ opportunities for language learning.

AR11 Not one to hang out in the ivory tower, when I attend professional conferences and meetings in the big cities, I do not go sightseeing on my free time. I visit the schools. What is happening to Black youth in these schools is not a pretty picture. The devastation and ugliness is so awesome that it drove me to establish a mentoring program (now in its 9th year) involving university students and middle school students. Saturday mornings I make the hour-and-a-half drive from the cozy comfort of our beautiful college campus to the city to work with Black youth and their teachers. We do not have any illusions about the impact of our work, nor are we naïve enough to think that our efforts alone can save the children.

Careful reading of the above texts, however, might suggest that they are promoting more than the writers’ solid, practical experience in the field. Ostensibly, the professional persona and the concomitant professional experience are being foregrounded here, but the emphasis on the “I” pronoun invites us to come closer to the writers as individuals. The person as well as the professional is being revealed.

And in each case the person comes across as attractive; adaptable, receptive, caring, reflective – admirable qualities in both the public and private identity. Most readers would be happy to accept such people as authority figures.

One other text which is equally overt in reporting sound field experience and which blurs even further the distinction between professional experience in the field and the private persona is AR1:

AR1 ...I confess I am a worrier; my now grown children remind me regularly of that vice. Indeed, my tendency is to take what I read too seriously, always to be concerned with improving my teaching (and my students' learning), and at least initially to be intimidated by the proclamation of others. I tend to worry an idea as a dog worries a bone, working it over and over until I come to some resolution. Thus, it took me a decade to decide to write this article on myths and nearly 2 years to complete it.

AR1 transmits a powerful message here. She has reflected deeply on the issue of appropriation of students' texts for more than ten years i.e. her thoughts on the matter merit our serious attention. Her views are those of a well-read, reflective and highly experienced professional, dedicated to the improvement of her teaching and her students' learning. The ten years contemplating the writing of this article were, it is implied, years spent in the practice of teaching writing and in the study of the relevant, most up-to-date research. The writer of AR1 presents herself as a thoroughly experienced practitioner in the teaching of writing.

AR5 is perhaps the most personal of all the field experience reported here. It is 'hands-on' experience detailed from the learner's rather than the teacher's point of view:

AR5I initially began working with a conscious decision to adopt what might be called my *Chinese persona* when attempting literacy tasks. I was of course working at a much more elementary level than Shen was, so for me it was less a matter of rejecting notions of individuality than one of moving into a more receptive mind-set. I took away from myself

the need to struggle and achieve control and substituted a greater focus on the moment and a greater trust that the experience would be ultimately beneficial irrespective of the momentary outcome.

Bell, as the author of *Literacy, Culture and Identity* (in press), has nothing to prove as an authority on teaching/studying literacy skills. When called on to expand on some of the points raised in her article by a Reacting Reader, she could well have relied entirely on past authority (her own published work included), but she does not. Although Shen (1989) is mentioned, she answers largely in a personal voice, happy to detail her own 'guinea-pig' experience of approaching learning Chinese.

In their different ways, the above 5 Responding Authors launch their discussion with the spotlight firmly turned on themselves and their lived experience. Later, the discussion may well turn academic again, calling upon past authority, questioning definitions, refuting debating points etc. The fact remains, however, that all 5 authors have presented themselves close to the outset of the texts in very human terms, in terms of personal, practical experience. In texts which are often challenging for the reading public to follow, these departures make it easier for readers to identify with writers as individuals. How far they may continue to identify with them as the discussion unfolds remains to be seen. At the outset, however, such a step detailing practical experience in the field helps confer the Author with a certain approachable authority in the eyes of the reading public – and, as such, is not to be overlooked in the complex business of constructing discourse community ascendancy.

6.5.3. Step 3 Cultivating reader complicity

Like Step 2, this step is one more popular with Responding Authors than Reacting Readers. Like Step 2, it also is performed in relatively small numbers (6 instances; five by Authors and one by a Reader). It is a step, however, which merits being studied alongside Step 2 (5 instances), for both steps, in their different ways, combine in their attempts to draw the reading public closer to the writer before a full discussion gets under way.

AR4 takes the route of the Author restating and clarifying her original intentions in writing her article:

AR4 In conducting my research and in writing the article, it was never my intention to serve as an apologist for poststructuralist theories. Instead, I drew on poststructuralist theories to help me make sense of my data and to examine how they might inform second language acquisition theory. Whereas I recognize that there is a complex relationship between theory and research (Peirce, 1995b), I do not believe a researcher should tailor her or his analysis to suit a particular theoretical orientation. Thus the question I asked in my research was as follows: "To what extent can poststructuralist theory help me to understand my data"? The question was not, as Price assumes, "To what extent does my data support poststructuralist theory?"

Such a statement undoubtedly helps focus the issues for the general reader and clarify the Author's intentions. The Author draws the said general reader closer by so doing, for the reader appears to be being taken not only into the Author's confidence regarding her intentions but also into the thought processes that led her there. But surely there is more going on here than the restatement of the Author's goals? Clearing up once and for all for the benefit of the reader what her intentions truly were may well of course be central to this step. Yet, with that "...as Price assumes,...",

is there not also an attempt to undermine Price in the eyes of the reading public? By reducing her original intentions to a limpidly clear question, she is helping facilitate reader understanding of her own position. But by reducing Price's stance to an equally clear-cut question, is she *truly* doing justice to his standpoint? Would Price himself agree with this exegesis of his reasoned reaction? Without going back to read again Price's text, the unwary reader may well second this 'helpful' glossing of the 2 scholars' positions and accord agreement to the Author.

In RR6, we see a similar attempt by a Reader this time to sharpen the focus on the issues for the benefit of the reading public at large:.

RR6 Trying to determine precisely what it means to have two forms of knowledge, conceptual and perceptual, opens a Pandora's box. If we follow Johnson's suggestions, we as L2 teacher educators could establish two different sets of criteria for identifying the two knowledge types, and we might say that the conceptual and perceptual are themselves both cases of knowledge. But do we and our students, prospective or practicing teachers, have correct expectations about when to use each type of knowledge, what activities are appropriate for each type of knowledge, and in what sequence to use them? L2 teachers could benefit from the philosophers of education who dissolved this issue of separation of ideas and things rather than trying to resolve it.

Here again, the writer sets out the two opposing standpoints with commendable clarity. To distinguish between the idea of conceptual and perceptive knowledge?, as Johnson believes. Or to dissolve the separation of the two?, as the Reader argues. Is this clarification, however, as even handed as it might be? Is that question towards the end of the extract an open-ended rhetorical question? Or does it expect the answer 'no', thus placing the reader in opposition to Johnson and in sympathy with the Reader? Once again, we might feel that focusing the issues is not the only activity under way here. By crystallizing the ideas so sharply and by illuminating so clearly the contours of the debate, the writer is helping to eradicate

distancing complexities and to draw the reading public into a comforting complicity with the Reader and her arguments - and away from the viewpoint of Johnson.

In AR12 we see a similar desire to set the record straight about the Author's stance and intentions, which may have been misinterpreted by a careless reading. The Author is keen not to be thought to be claiming more for her report than she really is. Here again we see a tightening of the discussion focus by allowing the reader an intimate glimpse into the goals that Hamp-Lyons set herself:

AR12 ..I agreed with the *TESOL Quarterly's* editor that my purpose was not to single out any individual authors and that the books should be unidentified. Length restrictions required the removal of the detailed framework of descriptors and the scores for each text as well as the criteria for ethicality in test preparation materials, which I arrived at not by 'devising them' myself but by combining two similar sets of criteria from experts in the field of educational measurement... But a more important clarification is that its purpose was not to attack the TOEFL or the Educational Testing Service. The purpose was, rather, to direct critical attention toward all unethical test preparation materials, and only unethical ones.

Once we understand all this, the underlying implication suggests, we shall be better equipped to understand her original article and the discussion which follows.

More pertinently perhaps, such a statement of blameless intentions presents Hamp-Lyons as a decent human being and scholar, one to whom in her unpartisan even-handedness we can safely accord authority. (After all, Hamp-Lyons slips in discreetly, she already has the backing of the *TESOL Quarterly* editor.)

Like AR12 which set out to set the record straight about the Author's stance and intentions, AR2 attempts a similar contextualizing of the circumstances of publication. Both texts seek general reader understanding by stressing the limitations imposed by circumstances on what appeared in print:

AR2 First of all, I would to underline the fact that the work I reported on represents only a small part of a larger project (in progress) concerning class size and the role of different classroom-related variables – including such learner factors as learning strategies – in successful second language acquisition (SLA).

AR12 I first stress that the commentary was a drastically reduced version of my original submission... Length restrictions required the removal of the detailed framework of descriptors and the scores for each text as well as the criteria for ethicality in test preparation materials...

In the case of AR2, the reason for the less than complete nature of the published text was due to the ongoing nature of the research; in the case of AR12, exigencies of space truncated a fuller version. This insistence on the incomplete nature of the published material invites the reader not to judge the texts too harshly for they represent only a fraction of a richer insight currently unavailable to the reader for various reasons. Both Authors, too, are keen to advise readers that any negative commentary was not the result of conscious hostility:

AR2 The report in the *TESOL Quarterly* (LoCastro, 1994), which is a short, seven-page text, was written to say something about the inconsistencies I found, not to criticize the SILL.

AR12 But a more important clarification is that its purpose was not to attack the TOEFL or the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The purpose was, rather, to direct critical attention toward all unethical test preparation materials, and only unethical ones.

Reader complicity, it would appear, might be jeopardized by any perceived aggressive, negating intentions and both Authors are keen to play down any such suggestion with these emollient, helpful clarifications of their intentions when they composed their articles.

AR3 pursues clarification for the benefit of the reading public with ‘a note on terminology’ by helpfully clearing up what he feels are certain ambiguities

surrounding the words *approach, method, technique, design and procedure* before settling down to drawing readers into a deeper understanding of his intentions.

AR3 In my article, I have tried to make a distinction between method as conceptualized by theorists and method as actualized by practitioners.....I have accordingly classified language teaching methods into three broad categories: language centered, learner centered, and learning centered methods. From such a perspective, it is doubtful whether one could even consider Total Physical Response (TPR), Suggestopedia, and The Silent Way as methods; to me, they are innovative classroom procedures that are consistent with the theoretical underpinnings of a learner-centered method.

Helpfulness, too, drives the writer of AR1.

My secondary objective in writing the article was to reconstruct the impact of the appropriation issue on my teaching, reflecting on what I had learned . The primary objective was to share this reflection with other teachers and teachers-in-training who might as a consequence learn, more quickly and efficiently than I did, that we teachers need to have more self-confidence in our choices regarding intervention.

Her obvious concern for her students, fellow teachers and teachers-in-training promotes her as someone who is writing overtly to place this experience at the service of the readers, one whose ‘primary objective was to share’ her ‘reflection’ with others involved in teaching and invites collegial complicity and bonding.

Although all 6 extracts work ingeniously at winning reader complicity by inviting them to a closer understanding of writers’ aims, beliefs and intentions, they do so in two distinct ways. While the first two we looked at subtly sought to undermine the position of the trigger text, the later four sought to strengthen the Responding Author’s perspective by underlining the attractiveness of the said Author’s persona and, often, the modesty of his/her intentions. Together, they seek to close the gap between reading public and writer and assure the former’s support.

6.5.4. Move 4 Postscript

Throughout the 3 steps which structure this move, we note that in their various ways these steps work towards winning the reading public's trust for the writers. The literature reviews of Step 1 are there to demonstrate their scholarly credentials. We are, the step implies, knowledgeable commentators whom you can rely on for authoritative guidance in this discussion. Step 2 attempts to show the participants as experienced practitioners in the field, while Step 3 seeks to close the gap between writers and the reading public by presenting the former as non-aggressive ESOL practitioners, modest in their aims, who are keen (and able) to elucidate not only professional issues with good sense and good-manners but also to elaborate on their personal motivations and intentions in setting pen to paper.

By taking time out in this move to build the trust of the reading public, writers here underpin a claim to be not only knowledgeable colleagues but helpful ones, too. By positioning themselves as erudite professionals keen to facilitate reader understanding, writers here quietly establish a useful authority in their bid for ascendancy.

6.6 Move and step selection behaviour of RR and AR texts

The first of the following two pages summarizes the behaviour adopted by Readers and Authors in their entry strategies; the second tabulates their behaviour pattern.

Move 1	Acknowledging contribution positively
Move 2	Overviewing trigger text content
Step 1	Creating quotation-rich review Or
Step 2	Creating abridged paraphrase
Move 3	Priming reply
Step 1A	Signalling generalized dissent (with concession marker) Or
Step 1B	Signalling generalized dissent (without concession marker) Or
Step 2	Signalling particularized dissent (with concession marker) Or
Step 3	Signalling text direction
Move 4	Establishing authority
Step 1	Reviewing literature And/or
Step 2	Reporting field experience And/or
Step 3	Cultivating reader complicity

Table 3. Entry strategy of Readers and Authors

	Move 1	Move 2		Move 3				Move 4		
		S.1	S.2	S.1A	S.1B	S.2	S.3	S.1	S.2	S.3.
RR1	X			X				X		
RR2	(x)				X			X		
RR3	X					X		X		
RR4	X	X								
RR5	X		X					X		
RR6	X		X					X		X
RR7	X	X*	X*			X				
RR8		X						X		
RR9		X				X				
RR10	X		X					X		
RR11			X			X				
RR12	X		X				X			
RR13	X		X			X		X		
RR14	(x)		X	X						
RR15	X			X						

Table 4 Reader behaviour

(x) denotes alternative but related form of move. * denotes discussion in 6.3.1.

	Move 1	Move 2		Move 3				Move 4		
		S.1	S.2	S.1A	S.1B	S.2	S.3	S.1	S.2	S.3
AR1	X		X						X	X
AR2	X						X		X	X
AR3	X		X					X		X
AR4	X		X							X
AR5	X		X				X		X	
AR6		X							X	
AR7	X						X			
AR8		X								
AR9			X							
AR10	X		X							
AR11									X	
AR12	X									X
AR13	X		X					X		
AR14					X					
AR15	X									

Table 5 Author behaviour

7. ANALYSING THE TEXTS: Cognitive processing and its role in the intertextual critical exchange.

As we have already noted, the central act of discussion or debate in these texts is delayed until various generic opening moves have been completed. As we have seen, these moves are largely paralleled in the texts of both Reacting Readers and Responding Authors.

When we move deeper into the central portions of these texts, heading for the heart of the debate, we note, however, that genre-type rhetorical organization patterns tend to efface themselves in favour of more seemingly idiosyncratic acts of cognitive processing organized around actualizing the ‘responses and rebuttals’ of the “Forum” section’s rubric. Whereas we saw fairly conventionalized and standardized organization being applied by Readers and Authors alike in launching their texts, in the core sections the shaping of the discussion appears more attributable to the individual Reader’s and Author’s personal response to the trigger text in question. While the rhetorical organization of the earlier sections appeared to be shared by most members of this particular discourse community, the freer approach apparent in the core sections would appear to be a product of idiosyncratic socio-cognitive processing, rather than the cognitive structuring we had seen at work in the opening and closing sections of the texts. As Swales (1991:88) puts it:

..the nature of genres is that they coalesce *what* is sayable with *when* and *how* it is sayable.

In the texts we are examining we have seen evidence of the *whats*, the *whens* and the *hows* at work in the opening generic moves of both RR and AR texts. What

we see in the central sections is something much more *laissez-faire* in terms of these three parameters. Put simply, the conventionalized preliminaries of these intertextual critical exchanges (and the similarly typified exit strategies discussed in Chapter 8) place them firmly in the realm of a particular discourse community in the act of organizing a community-recognizable professional event, whereas the central sections involved in discussing the ‘responses and rebuttals’ form rather a category of discourse familiar to a wider public. It is the discourse of argument and debate and the property of no one community or text type, to which no genre-type organizational pattern pertains but which is performed according to schemata previously - and variously - internalized by the various participants to the argument or debate.

7.1. Reader Reaction: displacing the Author

We begin first by looking at the action of the Reader in this context.

The rubric of the “forum” section of TQ invites, as we have noted, ‘responses and rebuttals’. While the opening moves which we have examined clearly demonstrate that the ‘rebuttal’ rather than the more vaguely labeled ‘response’ is the preferred choice of Readers, the term *rebuttal* is a rather crudely undifferentiated one to characterize the often complex linguistic action that is taking place here.

The Reader, likewise the Author as we shall shortly see, is engaged in what we might call displacive discourse. It is displacive in the sense that it seeks to manoeuvre TQ readers away from the perspective of the trigger text and to prefer that of the text currently under their scrutiny. While there may or may not be overtly acknowledged agreement with certain aspects of the trigger text, the Reader’s entry into published discussion usually heralds comment which seeks to displace Reader-

selected points from the Author's original text. Readers arrogate to themselves the roles of evaluator and Primary Knower, action fully confirmed in e-mails from many of the Readers themselves (see Chapter 11).

7.2. Characterizing displacement

In the hands of our expert practitioners, the act of displacement here is a complex one, offering a cline of action extending from bald-on-record refutations to more nuanced rejections. Of course, if displacement is to convince TQ readers to prefer the perspective of the writer, the said writer must offer compelling grounds for this displacement. The mechanism by which this is achieved has recourse to what is often a schematic construct of a minimum of three parts from here on referred to as a 'displacement triad'.

7.3. Triads and their origin

We are familiar with tripartite rhetorical devices from the pioneering work of Bellack et al (1966), later theorized and brought to much greater prominence by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) in whose classroom exchanges they appear as Initiation, Response and Follow-up. Other believers in the tripartite construct as the basic unit of spoken discourse include Hinds (1982:302) who refers to it as a 'triplet' (question-answer-acknowledgement or remark-reply-acknowledgement). Bolivar (1994) follows them in detecting tripartite structures, not this time in face-to-face encounters, but in monosourced prosodic discourse. The term 'triad' is used by Bolivar (1994:276) to label the discourse structure she detected in English language newspaper editorials. The term 'triad' whose elements for Bolivar are 'lead', 'follow' and 'valuate' lends itself usefully to the naming of the tripartite construct under

discussion here. I join Bolivar in believing that, although there is no question of face-to-face turn-taking here, those basic tripartite organizational units present in spoken discourse can similarly be detected in written discourse. What then are the constituent parts of our triad and how are we to label them?

7.4.Unpacking a displacement triad

Below, taken from RR3, we have an exemplification of how the turns in displacement are organized:

- Turn 1 LoCastro observes that the SILL includes ‘no strategies specifically addressing listening as a means to learn(p.412).
- Turn 2 We find this not only puzzling but also misleading and untrue.
- Turn 3 There are a number of strategies, such as watching television in the target language or paying attention to what people say, in which listening is an essential component. All the conversation-related strategies of the SILL involve listening. Researchers and teachers have repeatedly used the SILL to obtain information on strategies for listening.

Little of the nomenclature used by earlier commentators to describe (in their various ways) the elements of tripartite rhetorical structures fits our purpose here. Our replacement triad demands some renaming if each of the three functions of the triad is to be described adequately.

Turn 1 is what we might call the *Identification* in that it is here that the Reader identifies the issue that s/he wishes to raise for discussion. Turn 2, in which it becomes evident that the Author-preferred view of the issue mentioned in the Identification is not the Reader-preferred view, performs an act of what we might call *Negation*, characterizing here the Author-preferred view as ‘puzzling’, ‘misleading’ and ‘untrue’, terms which, if shown to be justified, label such views as unworthy of

academic credence. Turn 3 is the *Replacement* which manifests considerable flexibility of action, as we shall later see, but which in the main offers either the grounds for Displacement and/or the Replacement itself.

The Identification turn is necessary to inform the TQ audience which of the trigger text's points the Reader is to select for discussion and, as such, answers a functional textual need. It is there principally to introduce the 'aboutness' (Hutchins 1977) of the triad. It focuses TQ readers on the topic that is to be debated. The Negation and Replacement turns are where we typically (though not exclusively) see writers in their evaluative and Primary Knower roles with regard to that topic and where we see perhaps the widest variations of approach.

It is important to stress that, while the Identification/ Negation/Replacement (INR) turns are at the heart of displacement triads, they are open to some flexibility of usage. At times, turns follow each other closely to construct not only a displacement triad but a displacement paragraph. At others, the turn is subject to illustrative digressions and additions before embarking on the subsequent turn. Nevertheless, whether performed in a tightly-knit or extended version, the INR triad is the construct that comes closest to an archetypical model for displacement as it is here performed.

Of the 15 RR texts examined, 12 gave fully structured examples of displacement triads. While the 3 remaining texts organized their commentary along lines that were more idiosyncratic, there were still detectable either embryonic or abandoned triads which the writer had not fully realized. Partially realized triads were an occasional feature, too, even in the texts favouring the fully structured displacement triad, thus suggesting that an awareness of such triads was sufficiently

well embedded, whether consciously or unconsciously, in writers' psyches to appear with some frequency in either fully or partially realized form.

We now turn to look at the constituent parts of the INR triad and begin with the Identification.

7.5. Identification

In the section 'Unpacking the displacement triad' we said, quoting Hutchins, that the Identification was there to introduce the 'aboutness' of the triad. Often this is the case:

- RR1 How to respond to student texts and avoid the abuses of appropriation is a good place to begin..
- RR2 LoCastro gathered quantitative data (using the SILL) and qualitative data (using group interviews), then contrasted the two kinds of data.
- RR6 She wants us to focus on a process of making sense of teachers' experience and on how to structure teacher education programs so that they foster this sense making.
- RR9 For Spack, labeling students by cultural group – Chinese or Russian, for example – is problematic because by doing so, teachers are setting themselves up to perpetuate myths about these cultures.
- RR13 Like others, I am interested in critical pedagogy and strongly desire to see a critical pedagogical orientation promoted within higher education and specifically in language teaching and learning.

But as we shall see in our discussion of the Type 3 Negation below, the Identification turn can also be adapted to perform an evaluative role, serving with a negation to form a combined act of negation as we shall see in 7.6.3.

So, although a primary role for Initiation is to state the 'aboutness' of the first section of the triad, it can also be manipulated to introduce evaluation into the displacive discourse at an early stage, as we shall shortly see, thus avoiding a discrete statement of negation if the Reader so wishes.

7.6. 3 types of Negation

In exploring the Negation turn, we note three forms of its realization.

7.6.1. Type 1: non-concessive Negation

Reacting Readers in these texts avail themselves of various forms of Negation.

The most trenchant of these is the non-concessive Negation:

- RR2 The conclusion she drew from comparing these two kinds of data are unjustified.
- RR2 We find this not only puzzling but also misleading and untrue.
- RR2 This is patently wrong.
- RR4 Whether Pierce overcomes dichotomy of language learner/learning context is questionable, as is, consequently, whether she raises the most pertinent and pressing questions that poststructural theory raise for second language acquisition (SLA) theory.
- RR8 We cannot not classify!
- RR13 Furthermore, because language instruction in its very essence is content free and differs in nature from concepts discussed in contexts such as teacher education, Crookes and Lehner's report does not show how critical pedagogy in content courses informs teachers about its use in classrooms where students need to learn nouns, verbs and adjectives.

The first point to note here is the limitations imposed by the word 'rebuttal'. I am careful to avoid its use in such a context, for while it describes adequately the action conducted in the first five examples, we cannot say that the writer of RR13 is rebutting what has been said or claimed. S/he rather is pointing out an inadequacy in the report which s/he will address. This weakness in the report, it is implied, will be displaced and some more satisfactory replacement offered by the reacting Reader – although as yet we are not sure how or if this will in fact be effected. Hence the use of the more broadly encompassing term 'displacement triad' rather than 'rebuttal triad'.

Here we see displacement being performed in a way that is entirely unhedged and unapologetically bald-on-record. At first glance, RR4 might appear to reveal a softening of utterance with its use of the word ‘questionable’ rather than ‘unjustified’, ‘misleading’ or ‘untrue’, but in academia that which is open to question is open to attack and that clearly is what we are being positioned to witness.

7.6.2. Type 2: concessive Negation

Remembering the frequency of politeness strategies undertaken by Readers and Authors alike in the opening moves, we are not surprised unduly when they reappear before the actual act of displacement, arguably the most face-threatening point in the text. Many writers again resort to emollient tactics by preceding the displacement with statements which seek to recognize aspects of the text which they respect and accept:

- RR1 With that said, I would not dispute Reid’s earnest account of coming to terms with the troubling issues associated with appropriation and finding a satisfactory solution for her teaching. We have all had these private doubts and struggles to define our classroom practice. But I cannot accept as accurate her analysis of the type of influence process and writers issues have exerted on our discipline.
- RR3 Although this may be correct, Kumaradivelu’s reasoning for substituting methods is, I believe, flawed.
- RR4 Although Peirce shows the importance of circumstance in shaping the relative ease or difficulty with which the right to speak can be claimed (in contrast to the concept or motivation that she claims provides no space for such variability), not only does her argument rely on the concept of continuing identity (mother in Marina’s case) that resists prevailing practices because it insists on a meaning independent of these practices, but she also grounds investment itself in noncontingent, ahistorical subject.
- RR6 Her suggestions to use case-based methods, professional development schools, and portfolio assessment are legitimate. She does not, however, establish the thinking strategies and procedures that are necessary to empower L2 teachers-in-training to become reflective and critical thinkers.
- RR9 I agree with Spack that teachers must understand students’ strengths, but I disagree with her implied position that knowing more about students’ cultural backgrounds works against that understanding.

- RR10 Thus, although I recognize the advantages of adopting the community-of-practice perspective for language minority students, I have strong reservations about using the notion of LPP to describe the experiences of language minority students in the school community.
- RR13 In developing applications of critical pedagogy to language classrooms, supporting teacher education that is based on a critical pedagogical orientation, as demonstrated by Crookes and Lehner, is a practical beginning and an appropriate research step, but it is not sufficient.

In the negotiation between writer and TQ audience, the concession-assertion relation merits some attention. Thompson and Zhou (2000:129) see this relation as more than a politeness strategy:

Since the conceded proposition is not in fact the point that the writer wants to make, the need to mention it at all must derive from the writer's assumption that the other person might raise it as an objection and that he or she needs to forestall this.

The 'other person' here being the TQ audience, writers are essentially preempting a potentially damaging challenge from TQ readers to the Displacement by apparently signaling an awareness of merits in the original proposition. Or are they? Thompson and Zhou later cast some doubt on this:

..as has been frequently pointed out, we do not normally find it necessary to proclaim explicitly the truth value of a proposition unless that value is in some way in question. As Halliday (1994:89) puts it: 'you only say you are certain when you are not' – or, in broader and perhaps more accurate wording, saying explicitly that you believe something to be true admits the possibility of it not being believed to be true by everyone. In a case of a concession, of course, it is the writer who is simultaneously accepting the truth of a proposition and in a way calling it into question in relation to the following dominant assertion. (2000:130)

The concession-assertion construct here could well be seen to be effecting at least three functions:

- its graceful politeness to the original assertion disarms any potential hostility from TQ readers faced with its displacive ambitions

- its alert sensitivity to any potential objections by TQ readers forestalls these objections
- its explicit avowal of the original assertion's truth destabilizes to some extent that same assertion - if we accept the claims of Thompson and Zhou.

In all cases, such a construct is a valuable tool in the struggle to be accepted as Primary Knower.

Thompson and Zhou talk of 'the following dominant assertion' and we note that the above following assertions (i.e. following the concessions) are indeed dominant, by dint of their position in the information structure. In Hallidayan (1974, 1985) terms, the concession occupies the weaker or 'given' position, whereas the assertion enjoys the advantage of being in the strong, end-weighted 'new' position, thus favouring the writer's Displacement of the original claim.

We see, too, that here this given/new information structure applies not only in sentences but in longer stretches of text. RRs 3,9,10 and 13 well illustrate this view of information structure intrasententially, with RRs 1 and 6 providing evidence suprasententially. But whether within a single or multiple sentence format, there is no doubting the general writer awareness of the locational force (i.e. the power of the statement's position in the sentence) of such a displacive device.

7.6.3. Type 3: combination Negation

Whether concessively or non-concessively, a statement of negation occupied a discrete position in displacement triads types 1 and 2. There are texts here, however, where Negation abandons its independent niche to operate in conjunction with

another unit of the displacement triad. We note the example below succeeds in its negating mission without recourse to an independent statement of negation.

RR14 One problem with the article was the confusion it maintained between testing and assessment.

Here we have an Identification which not only performs its task of identifying the issue for discussion – the relationship between testing and assessment – but which effectively negates part of the original text with what we might call lexical anticipation. The Negation has here suffused the Identification in a way that Francis (1986, 1994) following Winter's work (1977, 1979) would see as cataphoric and demonstrative of what she would call 'advance labelling', in that certain words act as signposts to later developments in the text. Here the words *problem* and *confusion* commit the writer to their explanation and thus signal a prospective unpacking of these lexical items which will, if substantiated, negate the original writer's claims about testing and assessment. (There is a reminder here, too, of Tadros' work (1981, 1985, 1994) on prediction and a number of her 'enumerable' category nouns e.g. *difficulties*, *problems* [or 'sub-technical nouns' in Bolivar's terms (1994)] feature regularly in this section.) Given that there is no explicit statement of negation, the writer of this particular text now has the task of clarifying this evaluative signal in the subsequent Replacement. Or put another way, terms such as *difficulties*, *problems*, *inaccuracies* require lexical realization in the subsequent co-text. (Winter 1982,1992)

Lexical anticipation is similarly present in RR8:

RR8 Another difficulty with Spack's argument is that she has set up a false dichotomy - that our choice, as ESL/EFL teachers and researchers, is to view students either as members of cultural groups and individuals, not one or the other.

Here again we come upon lexical items in an Identification – *Another difficulty* - which require clarification by the writer. The resulting explanation will de facto realize an act of negation although this is not discretely performed. It is perhaps no coincidence that such signposted acts of negation are triggered by use of lexical items which are more than usually resonant when used in an academic setting: *problem, confusion, difficulty, false dichotomy*. RR14 returns to one of these emotive words:

Beyond the lack of clarity in the distinction between tests and assessments, a second confusion results from a haphazard coverage of the categories of tests/assessments.

But not only do we have *confusion* anticipating displative explanations, we have also *lack of clarity* and *haphazard* which again are lexical items likely to attract fairly detailed unfavourable unpacking.

Such combining of Identification with Negation is not uncommon as we see below:

- RR4 I wish to raise several questions concerning her theorizing of *social identity*, whether it actually does overcome the dichotomy she addresses and make consequent comments on agency, power, and practice in the application of post-structural thinking to SLA.
- RR11 Smitherman apparently did not investigate conditions in Oakland, as demonstrated by her use of a statistical inaccuracy to bolster her premise.
- RR15 First, his description of my work contains two factual inaccuracies.

Lexical anticipation is again the chosen device for displative ambitions. Terms and expressions which point forward to upcoming acts of displacement include: *raise several questions, make consequent comments, statistical inaccuracy, factual inaccuracies*.

When a Reader has to *raise several questions* as to *whether* the Author *actually does overcome* a dichotomy, then here, too, all is not well. Clearly, the dichotomy was not overcome sufficiently well to eradicate all doubt. As for *statistical inaccuracy* and *factual inaccuracies*, these are terms whose unpacking is calculated to do little to enhance the original Authors' standing in the eyes of the TQ audience. Lexical anticipation is once more used to signal upcoming, more detailed displace comment in these Identifications which marry 'aboutness' with evaluation.

7.7. Replacement.

Here Readers face their greatest challenge. To date, they have identified issues for discussion, they have participated in acts of negation (concessive or non-concessive, discrete or combined) with regard to these issues and now they are obliged to follow-up either with persuasive reasons for this negation and/or with persuasive replacement statements. How then *do* Readers behave at this point?

7.7.1. Factual counterclaiming

One of the more popular elements in the Replacement turn is the counterclaim and it is with it that we begin our study of Replacement.

Earlier, in 7.4., we took as our example the following triad from RR2:

Identification: LoCastro observes that the SILL includes 'no strategies specifically addressing listening as a mean to learn.(p.412).

Non-concessive-Negation: We find this not only puzzling but also misleading and untrue.

Replacement: There are a number of strategies, such as watching television in the target language or paying attention to what people say, in which listening is an essential component. All the conversation-related strategies of the SILL involve listening. Researchers and teachers have repeatedly used the SILL to obtain information on strategies for listening.

But as the research went on, we found that texts where the Replacement turn performed only a single action were not numerous. The single-action Replacement turn was largely, but not exclusively, favoured when correcting matters of public record, as above. Writers, when counterclaiming with reference to empirically-sourced material, evidently felt no greater effort was needed other than a citing of the relevant correct information. We see this again later in RR2:

Identification: She indicates that there is some confusion in her mind about the statement that “most learning strategies can be applied equally well to both ESL and EFL situations”, which she says comes from page 6 of Oxford (1990) and about the fact that the version of the SILL she used was Version 7.0 for ESL/EFL. She says, “No explanation is given for the meaning of the label” (pp.411-412).

Non-concessive negation: This is patently wrong.

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: Oxford (1990, p.6) spends three full paragraphs (with their own major headings) discussing the differences between second and foreign language settings. The appendix to the same book contains SILL Version 5.1 (for native English speakers learning another language) and Version 7.0 (for nonnative speakers learning English). The differences, along with when to use each version, are fully explained on page 199 in the assessment chapter of the book. (RR2)

RR15 similarly counterclaims with recourse to a single-action Replacement:

Type 3 negation: First, his description of my work contains two factual inaccuracies.

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: He states, “For instance, Goldstein (1987) focuses on the linguistic features of Black English as found in the speech of Puerto Rican youths in New York City” (p.352). In fact, I described the learners as follows:” William, 16 years old, and Paternoster, 18, were both students in the same high school in the New York City metropolitan area. William had lived in Jersey City for 5 years, Paternoster for 3. Both were born in Ecuador, and both spoke Spanish as their first language” (Goldstein, 1987,p.148). In fact, my subjects were not Puerto Rican (elsewhere in my article I referenced my subjects as Hispanic and speakers of Spanish), and they were not all from New York City. Some, as I wrote in the above quotation and elsewhere, were from Jersey City, New Jersey.

And later in the same text we have a second example of this:

Type 3 negation:

Of even greater concern is Ibrahim’s mischaracterization of my research questions and results.

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: He states:

..For instance, Goldstein (1987) focuses on the linguistic features of Black English as found in the speech of Puerto Rican youths in New York City. *However, she does not address the issue of what it means for Puerto Rican youths to learn Black English [italics added]*.....Instead Goldstein offers a very meticulous syntactico-morphological analysis. (p.352)

What I did goes far beyond ‘a very meticulous syntactico-morphological analysis’(p.352) and, contrary to the author’s claims about what I did not do, my article directly addressed the question of the role of identification in what individuals learn: *{instances listed}*

I addressed and discussed the role of identification in my subjects’ acquisition of Black English versus standard English in many other places within the article.

When, however, we move away from the relatively straightforward action of counterclaiming with information that can be concretely verified, the Replacement turn becomes a much more complex construct, demanding a noticeably greater rhetorical effort as we shall see below.

7.7.2.The Bi-partite Replacement

Above we were dealing with Replacements centred around factual corrections. Once writers approach Replacements demanding persuasive argument rather than ‘rehabilitated’ information, however, the rhetorical effort is intensified. Writers now are no longer content with producing Replacements involving a single sociocognitive element; now they rely on a Replacement which frequently not only replaces but underpins this replacement with another element either giving grounds for the replacement or reasons for the displacement. Writers here are parrying ideas rather than fact.

From the point of view of terminology, these bi-partite Replacement structures will be referred to as Replacement ‘dyads’. Each dyad is made up of two

‘lines’. The first of these conducts what is described as ‘primary’ action and the following one, ‘secondary’ action.

7.7.3. Ideational counterclaiming

To illustrate this, we look at another RR text where this time the counterclaim is driven not by a need to correct factual information but by a need to construct a better counterargument based on alternative thinking or ideas. In an attempt to gather community consensus around both the Displacement and its Replacement, writers redouble, quite literally, their rhetorical effort in the Replacement turn. This example is taken from RR3:

Identification: As overall principles, strategies cannot take the place of specific methods/procedures/techniques because only through the latter can teachers accomplish their classroom objective. Kumaravadivelu’s argument for replacing methods/procedures seem to be that “none of these methods can be realized in their purist form” (p.29), and none of the methods work for all students at all times.

Concessive negation: Although this may be correct, Kumaravadivelu’s reasoning for substituting methods is, I believe, flawed.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Few things occur in their purest form. The fact that none of the methods work in all situations for all students does not mean that they are useless. On the contrary, these methods are invaluable because good teachers can select the best methods for the specific situation.

Counterclaim support: Total Physical Response (TPR), for example, has proven to be a very effective method for beginning students, children and adults alike. Grammar-Translation often works very well for a homogeneous class of educated adults who need only reading knowledge in the target language. The problems we have are not with the methods but with those who use the methods in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Not content with a statement that simply counterclaims, the writer here illustrates the Replacement with examples drawn from experience to bring weight to the countering claim. He/she gives an exposition of *why* this ‘correction’ of the original claim is worthy of our attention and support in the bid for Primary Knower status.

Of the 9 examples of displacement by counterclaim as the first element in the

Replacement in RR texts, 3 others followed this pattern:

RR12

Identification: In claiming that the TOEFL and TOEFL preparation materials are based on discrete chunks of language rules and frequently without co-text or context, perhaps Hamp-Lyons mainly has in mind the Structure and Written Expression section of the exam (the shortest of the three sections).

Concessive negation: Here, her charge contains its largest grain of truth, and it is this section of the exam that is most in need of revision.. Yet even if one arbitrarily limits Hamp-Lyons' critique to this section, she appears to overextrapolate from the TOEFL preparation texts she perused and sharply oversteps the facts when she surmises that

the only strategy for deciding what language areas to focus on would seem to be to work out the probable frequency of different types of items or probes across multiple, actual TOEFL forms. But even this strategy leaves the teacher with nothing more than a laundry list of grammatical or lexical points to be covered. (p.334)

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Many preparation texts indeed inadequately treat this decontextualized section of the exam, but this does not mean that the test presents a mere "laundry list" of grammatical and lexical mistakes. Even this most dubious subtext of the TOEFL focuses largely on commonly occurring language errors that significantly impede fluency and accuracy (e.g., incomplete sentences, pronoun errors, subject-verb agreement) that are distracting (if not unacceptable) to many academic readers, particularly the North American professors who will read and grade the students' future written work.

Counterclaim support: Although L1 compositionists have long abandoned error correction as their principal focus, cutting-edge contemporary writing teachers nevertheless include in their pedagogical brief a commitment to cultivating students' awareness of the widely subscribed to (and admittedly politicized) conventions of written English, if sometimes only for the pragmatic reason that less enlightened faculty (and administrators) elsewhere in the university will not tolerate what they view as work riddled with repeated and egregious violations of grammar and usage.

RR8

Type 3 negation: Another difficulty with Spack's argument is that she has set up a false dichotomy – that our choice, as ESL/EFL teachers and researchers, is to view students either as members of cultural groups or as individuals.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Students (and other human beings) are both members of groups and individuals, not one or the other.

Counterclaim support: The goal, then, in interacting with members of other cultures is to move from knowing a person as a member of a culture to knowing the persona as an individual. However, as individuals, humans are still members of cultures. To illustrate the impact of culture on the individual, Gudykunst and Kim (1984) modified Miller and Steinberg's (1975) model, changing the names of the levels of psychocultural, sociocultural, and cultural. In so doing, they emphasized that even at a psychological (i.e., individual, personal, idiosyncratic) level of interaction, all parties are members of a culture. Humans cannot be cultureless or culture free.

RR9

Identification: For Spack, labeling students by cultural group – Chinese or Russian, for example – is problematic because by doing so, teachers are setting themselves up to perpetuate myths about these cultures.

Concessive negation: I agree with Spack that teachers must understand students' strengths, but I disagree with her implied position that knowing more about students' cultural backgrounds works against that understanding.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim

I would argue that teachers who find themselves 'falling into the trap of developing and perpetuating stereotypes – and ultimately of underestimating students' knowledge and their writing skill" (p.767) are teachers who most likely fail to understand what these students bring to the learning environment. Rather, teachers need to recognize ways in which students are likely to differ from the teachers' necessarily restricted understanding of learners' backgrounds so that they can both appreciate and draw on the students' knowledge and skills.

Counterclaim support: Applied linguistics is a relatively new discipline, and there is still much to learn about the complex interactions that shape any learner's acquisition of an L2. Myths have no place in our developing picture of language learners and of language learning, and we as L2 instructors must continue to ask relevant questions and explore possible answers to these questions...Not to question how this background might affect language acquisition is to deny an essential aspect of these learners' experience and will ultimately lead to an incomplete and inaccurate description of their language learning.

In the final example of a bi-partite counterclaim Replacement, the writer of RR1 chose to follow the counterclaim not with an explanatory support of the counterclaim but with an overt rebuttal of the Author's beliefs:

Identification: How to respond to student texts and avoid the abuses of appropriation is a good place to begin.....

Non-concessive negation: I do not believe that research has intimidated a significant number of ESL teachers from limiting their responses to student texts.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Leki (1990), for example, mentions the problem of appropriation without noting an overreaction one way or the other. Her advice for dealing with a case of appropriation coincides with Greenhalgh's (1992) and does not suggest that we should be so irresponsible as to completely disengage ourselves from students' texts to allow for some sort of vacuous writing experience.

Belief/practice rebuttal: With that said, I would not dispute Reid's earnest account of coming to terms with the troubling issues associated with appropriation.... But I cannot accept as accurate her analysis of the type of influence process and writer issues have exerted on our discipline. There are myths and then there are myths.

Of the nine Replacements involving counterclaims we see four of them dealing with factual corrections and as such appear to recognize no need for further rhetorical action. Of the five opting for counterclaims requiring additional input from the Reacting Reader, four of the five chose to support the counterclaim with discursive support which sought to bring additional reflective weight to the new proposition; the fifth chose to leave the counterclaim unsupported and to reject the original claim yet again.

7.7.4. Citing notional misunderstanding

Related to the counterclaim-type Replacement is the Replacement which maintains that a notional misunderstanding has crept into the Author's work. They are related in that both Replacements point to what they perceive as 'error'. The counterclaim-type Replacement states the Author's 'faulty' claim/stance and then goes directly to the writer's perceived 'correction' of that claim/stance, often giving the supporting reasons for this new proposition; the approach of writers citing notional misunderstanding is not to seek to replace directly one 'truth' with another, but to point out the Author's inadequate grasp of subject knowledge or fundamental conceptual misunderstanding that led to the 'error' in the first place before selecting a variety of follow-throughs within the second element of the Replacement. Ultimately, however, the aim is the same. Whatever approach is preferred, it helps fulfil the displacive intentions of Readers and finds them angling for Primary Knower status in the eyes of the TQ public.

One of the most succinct of this type of displacement is conducted in RR8:

Identification: The process of classifying , categorizing, or labeling is cognitive. It is what our brain does.

Non-concessive negation: We cannot not classify!

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: Spack, therefore, has based her argument on a false assumption. She is assuming that we can choose to classify or not.

Clarification by counterclaim: We have no choice. Our brains classify.

Here we have a rare example of a counterclaim being reserved for the final position in the Replacement dyad, a counterclaim made by the Reader which ‘corrects’ an error of conceptualization made by the Author. Other texts choose to follow the pointing out of imperfect thought processes in various ways. RR13, for example, cites notional misunderstanding twice as grounds for Replacement but follows each one up in a different way:

Identification: Crookes and Lehner point out that “critical pedagogy should be seen as a social and educational process rather than just as a pedagogical method” (p.327).

Concessive negation:

In developing applications of critical pedagogy to language classrooms, supporting teacher education that is based on a critical pedagogical orientation, as demonstrated by Crookes and Lehner, is a practical beginning and an appropriate research step, but it is not sufficient.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: The joint goals of critical pedagogy, the “simultaneous development of English communicative abilities and the ability to apply them to developing a critical awareness and the ability to act on it to improve matters” (p.320), are not what administrators perceive as the mission of most S/FL programs.

Offering notional clarification: Administrators may expect teachers to adopt a communicative approach through the exclusive use of the target language, so-called authentic materials, and so-called meaningful interaction with the goal of developing nativelike competency in the S/FL. The expectations may frustrate the teacher who is equally interested in engaging in a problem-posing pedagogy and providing opportunities for learners to participate in problem-posing activities conducted in the target language when appropriate.

Here the Reader chooses to expound a ‘correction’ to the notional misunderstanding detected in the Author’s text. Later the same Reader chooses to follow the citing of a further notional misunderstanding in another way:

Identification: Like others, I am interested in critical pedagogy and strongly desire to see a critical pedagogical orientation promoted within higher education and specifically in language teaching and learning.

Non-concessive negation: I find it disheartening, however, to be frequently reminded of the importance and even necessity of such an orientation without being exposed to even a minimal idea of how to address the concerns that teachers face everyday.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: The brief phrase “subject to administrative constraints” (p.323) does not refer to a minor issue.

Citing article deficiency: Furthermore, because language instruction in its very essence is content free and differs in nature from concepts discussed in contexts such as teacher education, Crookes and Leher’s report does not show how critical pedagogy in content courses informs teachers about its use in classrooms where students need to learn nouns, verbs, and adjectives.

This time the Reader does not have so much a ‘clarification’ to offer (i.e. a more realistic reading – in Reader terms - of the situation) as a desire to point out that the problem is greater than the Authors understand and that the text fails to cover vital attendant issues. Here the two Authors’ espousal of critical pedagogy at the expense of any discussion of the concerns teachers face every day provokes the Reader to displace the downplaying of these everyday concerns. She points out that the report in question fails entirely to include discussion of how to square critical pedagogy with the important issue of “administrative constraints” and teachers’ daily classroom concerns.

In other words there are ‘errors’ of omission in the text as well a ‘errors’ of understanding in the Authors’ minds which both tend to displace the Authors as authority figures in the reading public’s eyes.

With the fourth example of a citing of notional misunderstanding we have in RR1 a return to the idea of the Reader as ‘clarifier’ of the said misunderstanding.

Identification: Appropriation certainly can exist in an expressivist, cognitivist, and eclectic classroom,

Concessive negation: and Reid has every right to alert us to the dangers as she sees them. But she misses the full extent of where and when appropriation can take hold,
REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: for it is even possible in her model. In the hands of a sincere but naïve or overly enthusiastic proponent of contrastive rhetoric, for example, the same sorts of extremes and abuses can happen as with process – and writer-oriented research.

Offering notional clarification: Like any other supporter of an evolving but controversial approach in our profession, an advocate of contrastive rhetoric must avoid its extremes... Intentionally or unintentionally, an advocate who veers too far toward theoretical relativism can convey to students the message that a single hypothesis about writing and the writer can encompass each student's culture, writing behavior, and needs.

The fifth and final example of a Reader accusing an Author of notional misunderstanding is to be found in the more complex reaction of the Reader in RR4.

Here the Reader's second element in the Replacement conflates two of the actions we have already seen in this position; it combines an analysis of the perceived error with a swipe at missing material:

Identification: However, I wish to raise several questions concerning her theorizing of social identity, whether it actually does overcome the dichotomy she addresses and make consequent comments on agency, power, and practice in the application of post-structural thinking to SLA..

Non-concessive negation: Whether Peirce overcomes dichotomy of language learner/learning context is questionable, as is, consequently, whether she raises the most pertinent and pressing questions that poststructural theory raises for second language acquisition (SLA) theory.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: Borrowing from Weedon, Peirce asserts "the multiple nature of the subject; subjectivity as a site of struggle; and subjectivity as changing" (p.15). Fundamental to her argument is the application of these characteristics to social identity. But this theoretical conflation of subjectivity and identity weakens her own position because it blinds her to the practical distinction she in fact necessarily continues to make.

Offering 'error' analysis + Citing article deficiency: I am suggesting then that Peirce's argument places discourse as a medium through which subject interests may be facilitated or impeded, but that she fails to adequately incorporate into her account how those interests themselves, and the subjects as such, is constructed by discourse. The identity the learner takes up and the resistance offered to alternative positions are presented as depending on meanings maintained individually, rather than socially. The danger here is of reducing (social) language use to (individual) language competence. Consequently, there is no indication that in challenging the discourse practices themselves, the subject identity and motivating interests are at the same time brought into question.

In those displacement triads finding Authors guilty of failing to understand their subject matter entirely, we find Readers either quick to ‘correct’ what they see as a failure of analysis by offering their own ‘clarification’ of the matter, or to take apart publicly the nature of the perceived ‘error’. But error can also be conceived of as an omission as well as a commission and this results in 2 of the texts referring to what they see as damaging omissions in the articles stemming from the Authors’ failure to comprehend their subject entirely correctly.

But whatever the approach, here we see Readers attempting to displace Authors by undermining the Authors’ critical faculties in the eyes of the TQ public and by arrogating to themselves the ascendant role of determining evaluator.

7.7.5. Notional misunderstanding: a variation

Before leaving displacement triads centred around notional misunderstanding, there is one triad which needs special attention. Although it takes a notional misunderstanding as its starting point and analyses a perceived error, it is not the misunderstanding of the Author to which the Reader draws attention (indeed she goes out of her way to support the Author’s latest position) but that of the TESOL community at large, or rather, those members of it who think LPP is a panacea for many problems of language acquisition. What is of interest here is that despite the fact that she is not engaging with an Author but a community, her displacement strategy follows that of the Readers above.

RR 10

Identification: But so far the field lacks a framework for discussing these issues as an integral part of language minority students’ language acquisition. The community-of-practice perspective may indeed prove to be such a framework. One of Toohey’s contributions is to introduce this framework to the field of language minority research, demonstrating that it can

illuminate those aspects of student experience that L2 educators knew were relevant but with which they did not know what to do.

Concessive negation: Thus, although I recognize the advantages of adopting the community-of-practice perspective for language minority research, I have strong reservations about using the notion of LPP to describe the experiences of language minority students in the school community.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: ...the situation of language minority students {in schools} seems to me to be considerably different from those highly specialized worlds in which apprenticeship is the standard mode of learning. It is true that some language minority students eventually acquire enough of the L2 and go on to participate more fully in the school community. But many others are probably permanently relegated to the margins, never allowed a chance to become full participants.

Offering 'error' analysis: School not only systematically blocks participants but simultaneously sends the message to language minority students that they are not allowed in because they are not worthy enough. Studies by McKay and Wong (1996) and by Harklau (1994) both point out that ESL is generally "stigmatized and remedial" (Harklau (p.259) and regarded as a "dummy program" (McKay and Wong, p.586). To the extent that identity is socially constructed (Mead, 1934; Peirce, 1995; Taylor, 1992), it is difficult for a person who is treated as a second-rate citizen to sustain self-esteem.

7.7.6. Citing contentious claim

The triad counterclaiming on various grounds and the triad citing notional misunderstanding were the two most popular strategies favoured by Reacting Readers to displace Authorial comment. They were not, however, the only tactics employed to displace.

RR4 found one Reader accusing an Author of unwarranted claims:

Identification: Peirce substitutes the term investment for motivation, arguing that it better signals "the socially and historically constructed relationship of the women to the target of language" (p.17). Yet investment does seem to be a function of a dominant and enduring identity (e.g. mother in the case of Martina) rather than of prevailing practices and which, like motivation, seems the dominant factor in determining whether or not the subject will insist on speaking.

Concessive negation: Although Peirce shows the importance of circumstance in shaping the relative ease or difficulty with which the right to speak can be claimed (in contrast to the concept of motivation that she claims provides no space for such variability), not only does her argument rely on the concept of continuing identity (mother in Martina's case) that resists prevailing practices because it insists on a meaning independent of these practices, but she also grounds investment itself in a noncontingent, ahistorical subject.

REPLACEMENT

Citing unsubstantiated claims: Thus, she argues that “if learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wide range of symbolic and material resources” (p.17). She adds, “learners will expect or hope to have a good return on that investment” and further that “this return on investment must be seen as commensurate with the effort expended on learning the second language” (p.17). There is no suggestion this a priori calculative rationality directing investment changes across cultures and over time. That is, it is not constructed in discourse but is an inherent quality of all human subjects. This is a very contentious claim and yet central to Peirce’s argument. The assumption of such a given, rational subject has been a central object of criticism by much poststructural and critical thinking alike.

Offering claim weakness analysis: I am suggesting that on the one hand Peirce resorts to a pre-given subject-agent, yet on the other argues that “subjectivity is produced in a variety of social sites, all of which are structured by relations of power” (p.15). The place of the subject-agent needs further clarification, especially if the dissolution of agency into social/discourse determinism is to be avoided.

Peirce deals with agency simply by asserting “the subject has human agency” and that consequently “the subject positions a subject takes up within a particular discourse are open to argument” (p.15) by the subject. However, whether the subject who resists does so according to interests and faculties that are discourse mediated or pre-given remains very unclear.

It is perhaps not misplaced to suggest that the Reader’s criticism here is one of the more potentially damaging to an academic reputation. Here we are dealing not with an honest error of fact or with a misunderstanding over some concept, as in previous displacements we have looked at, but rather a claim made by an Author for which no accepted academic authority has been generally established - in the Reader’s opinion, at least. I have quoted this extract at some length of necessity, for the most wounding words – *a very contentious claim and yet central to Peirce’s argument ,a central object of criticism by much poststructural and critical thinking alike, the subject...very unclear* - are deeply buried in a text which is trying painstakingly to avoid the perils of false accusation by insisting on a meticulously grounded rationale for its objections. Here we have one of the longer triads in the

study and it is perhaps no coincidence that this greater rhetorical effort is elicited by the seriousness of the accusation.

7.7.7. Citing imperfect methodology

Like the criticism above, the claim of an imperfect methodology strikes at the Author's standing as an academic. Wounding though it is, the charge is here argued much more succinctly than in the previous one. The reason may well be that the deficiency as noted is one of basic approach rather than of conceptual argumentation and as such requires less persuasive effort on the Reader's part to elicit our support; good academics, this displacement implies, know what to think of other academics whose methodology is inadequate. The rhetorical effort is consequently reduced in the following two displacements dealing with faulty methodology, where the Replacement turns are performed much more briefly than in many other Replacements and where in one instance the Replacement even reverts to a mono-partite structure

RR2

Type 3 negation: There are methodological problems in LoCastro's study.

REPLACEMENT

Citing imperfect methodology: The sample was very small, compared to the usual hundreds of most studies involving the SILL results. She does not address the issue of where the SILL results might be different with a larger sampling or with a different or more heterogeneous group.

The same Author is attacked again later for the same fault but with the a bi-partite

Replacement turn::

Identification: LoCastro's SILL results indicated medium or average overall strategy use among her subjects, and medium use of the six categories of strategies as well. She reports this finding,

Non-concessive negation: but because she fails

REPLACEMENT

Citing imperfect methodology: to report any other SILL date to compare it to – no students at other levels, and no statement of what she expected to find –

Citing consequence of methodological ‘error’: it is hard say what, if anything, the finding means.

RR6

Identification: It is more productive for us to think about teacher education as deliberate social experience. Johnson gives credence to “teaching as a socially constructed activity that requires the interpretation and negotiations of meanings embedded within classrooms and schools where teachers teach” (p.767). She wants us to focus on a process of making sense of teachers’ experience and on how to structure teacher education programs so that they foster this sense-making.

Concessive negation: Her suggestions to use case-based methods, professional development schools, and portfolio assessment are legitimate. She does not, however,.

REPLACEMENT

Citing article deficiency: ...establish the thinking strategies and procedures that are necessary to empower L2 teachers-in-training to become reflective and critical thinkers.

Offering article ‘correction’: Our students must be involved in higher level thinking if we are serious about wanting L2 teachers to be reflective practitioners.

If we expect teachers to be reflective practitioners and if we want prospective teachers to make sense of what they do in terms of the goals of teacher education programs, we need to teach higher level thinking that includes the ability to identify criteria, measure complex behaviors by establishing multiple and competing criteria, match measurements to appropriate criteria by categories, and evaluative performance with these multiple criteria in relation to the diverse goals of education. Then we could have the authentic assessment of teachers’ abilities that Johnson writes about.

A different kind of article deficiency is apparent in RR14. Here this Reader accused the Authors not of omitting to include important material but rather of confusing the material which had been included:

RR14

Type 3 negation: One problem with the article was the confusion it maintained between testing and assessment.

REPLACEMENT

Citing article deficiency: The authors state in the abstract that the purpose of the article is “to help teachers decide what types of language tests to use” (p.653) but then continue to talk about various kinds of “assessments”. The same confusion occurs at the top of page 658. In fact, the term *assessments* is very confusing and one is left wondering if the authors are evaluating different assessments, assessment task, tests, or assessment systems.

Offering article ‘correction’: Some readers might consider language assessment to refer ultimately to grading, and assessed activities can include tests, exams, and other activities not completed under controlled conditions. For this reason, Huerta-Macias (1995) refers to alternative assessments as “an alternative to standardized testing” (p.8). Rather than drawing a clear distinction between assessment and testing, Brown and Hudson appear to believe that the alternatives to tests and typical testing tasks can be added to existing assessment practices

in a quantitative manner. In ESOL, testing usually refers to both informal tests and more formal exams.

I understand a test as a performance activity or battery of performance activities of limited duration completed under controlled, supervised conditions by students who are graded individually by instructors. Exams are similar, but they tend to be more formal, are usually taken at terminal points of expected learning, and are graded by examiners. National and international exams are even more formal and are supervised externally, usually with rigorous reliability monitoring.

In both instances above, the charge against the Authors is a serious one. As experienced academics, they have failed – at least in the Reader’s eyes – to deliver an article which is fully-documented (in one case) or fully-coherent (in the other). Both ‘require’ the Reader to weigh in to offer the TQ public a more thoughtful reading of the pedagogical realities, thus foregrounding the Reader as a Primary Knower whose persuasively argued displacement and Replacement invites community consensus.

7.8. Postscript to Author displacement by Readers

For any academic or teaching professional seeking to make a contribution to his/her discourse community, we see from the analysis in this chapter that the need to construct texts that are factually accurate, ideationally sound, cogently argued, authority backed, coherently organized, comprehensively inclusive and methodologically orthodox is essential. In numerical terms, their action in the first line of the Replacement dyad is recorded below.

REPLACEMENT

Primary action (first line of dyad)

Citing notional misunderstanding	7
Ideational counterclaim	6
Factual counterclaim	5
Citing article deficiency	3
Citing imperfect methodology	2
Citing unsubstantiated claim	1

Table 6. Primary action in Readers' Replacements

It is perceived failure by Authors in one or more of these numerous areas that has invoked the challenge from the Reacting Reader. The list of various types of 'failings' which we have detected is a lengthy one and perhaps one difficult to assimilate in unedited form. Looking more closely at it, however, we begin to see that the 'faults' can be rationalized into broader categories. Authors are routinely accused of lack of proficiency in one or more of the following four categories:

Factual accuracy	This leads the Reader to make a factual counterclaim with what is seen as more accurate data. A critique of factual information.
Argumentative skills	This leads the Reader to make an ideational counterclaim, replacing 'faulty' reasoning with a 'corrected' interpretation. A critique of argument.
Conceptual knowledge	This leads the Reader to cite a notional misunderstanding. A critique of subject knowledge.
Research/textualization skills	This leads the Reader to criticize methodology, cite unsubstantiated claim or other article deficiency. A critique of research/writing competence

Table 7. Categorization of Readers' Replacements

Justified criticism in any of the above areas strikes seriously at academic reputation and undermines Primary Knower claims. The above are the main areas in which

Readers contend that Authors are in some ways lacking. We shall see in the next section how Authors respond.

Reflecting on the structure of the displacement triad we see that the Replacement section is perhaps the most critical of the three sections. For it is here that Reacting Readers are obliged to give either their replacement claim and/or the grounds for their displacive intervention. Pointing out failures in others is a dangerous business if you yourself have failed to convince with your own intervention. Replacement claims and displacement grounds must be fully and persuasively argued, hence the frequent phenomenon of the Replacement requiring a bipartite construction with the latter part regularly underpinning much of the following text until the next Identification.

What I have shown above is not always the entire Replacement, for that in some cases runs to several pages; what I have shown in the Replacements discussed here is the major *line* of intervention taken by Reacting Readers in formulating justification for their displacement activities. How Readers fill out the detail of that justification once the line is established is highly personal and individual to each text. What can be tabulated, however, as I have indicated above, is the *type* of cognitive process commonly favoured by Reacting Readers in their justification for intervention and in their quest for discourse ascendancy

While we see a fairly regular schema of Identification, Negation and Replacement operating at the higher level, the actions adopted to fill out these strategic categories see Readers approaching them not only with a great variety of tactics but also in a richly varied *combination* of tactics.

It remains to be seen if Authors will reply in kind in their turn.

7.9. Confronting displacement: the Author's Response

Before looking in detail at how Authors respond to displacement triads activated by Readers, it would be useful to consider the respective situations of Authors and Readers and the social roles intervention calls on them to play.

By entering into an intertextual critical exchange with an Author, Readers assume to themselves the role of evaluator. Their intervention is offered ostensibly as a contribution to the field yet there is, as we have seen, a jockeying for position as the Forum's Primary Knower.

We have looked in some detail at how Readers present themselves and at how they go about securing both consensus and displacement. But if Readers see themselves as evaluators, Authors are necessarily obliged to take up the role of the evaluated. Like Readers, Authors require persuasive tact in the positioning of their Response if the Forum's public is to be kept onside. How *do* Authors react under fire? The contribution to the field is frequently 'welcomed' and is hailed ostensibly as an 'opportunity' for enriching professional debate in the opening generic moves discussed in Chapter 6. Nevertheless, being personally or professionally evaluated in a public arena such as *TESOL Quarterly* has undoubtedly an affective dimension, as Authors have indicated to me in discussions. (see Chapter 11.) How then does this dimension affect the construction of their Responses, particularly those central sections which we are currently considering? Will we see the difference in social role altering the way in which linguistic structures are formulated and social action conducted?

7.9.1.Triads revisited

Text AR2 quickly and clearly indicated similarities of approach :

Identification: With regard to the second issue, Oxford and Green claim the SILL Version 7.0 is valid for both ESL and EFL settings.

Concessive negation: I have no quarrel with the distinctions which are offered; however, I do not agree with statements in Oxford (1990) such as the following: “these differences *occasionally* (my emphasis) have implications for language learning strategies” and “most learning strategies can be applied *equally* (my emphasis) well to both situations” (p.6)

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: The fact that the versions have been used with learners of many different languages does not necessarily mean the classification of the learning strategies nor the different kinds of learning strategies on the inventory are the most appropriate for assessing what learners do to learn languages with the L1 and sociocultural backgrounds cited by Oxford.

Counterclaim support: Given the ongoing debate about the relationship of language, thought, and culture, unlike Oxford, I am reluctant to claim that what learners do in one learning environment to learn is the same as or very similar to what learners do in other environments. There may be cognitive processing universals; however, as sociocultural practices pervade so many other areas of life, it is difficult to argue that they are absent with regard to learning strategies and processes.

Here we have a displacement triad that offers the INR turn structure that we met earlier when examining RR texts. Furthermore, the Replacement section dyad offers social action we have also met in these texts: the ideational counterclaim in first position. Remembering that the 15 RR texts produced 24 displacement triads, we note 21 in our 15 AR texts. Of the 21 displacements detected in AR texts 13 favoured a displacement triad structured around the INR format of the kind found above with a distinct bias towards counterclaiming. Counterclaiming of either the ideational or factual type as the primary element in the Replacement dyad was detected 13 times in AR texts, 2 more than our RR texts fielded.

In other words, in terms of favoured linguistic structures and social actions, the RR and AR texts revealed considerable similarities. Wholly typical of this was AR1

ARI

Identification: {Hall writes} that I overstate the ability of research to intimidate ESL teachers.

..I confess that I am a worrier. Indeed my tendency is to take what I read too seriously, always to be concerned with improving my teaching (and my students' learning), and at least initially to be intimidated by the proclamations of others.

Non-concessive negation: However, I believe Hall may understate the importance of the appropriation issue in the writing classroom.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Despite the fact that the discussion of the issue has all but disappeared from the research literature, I still see the question of response to and possible appropriation of student text as central to the whole enterprise of teaching writing.

Counterclaim support: The tension between appropriation and intervention appears whenever a teachers responds to a student paper; how to achieve that precarious balance between teaching and simply turning a student back into the writing process, between guidance that helps students to avoid serious problems and allowing students to learn from their own experiences, between intervening directly and providing opportunities for students to revise independently...I continue to struggle with this issue , and I think that many teachers also to balance 'teacherly' instruction with student learning. Thus, I believe that although the research discussion on appropriation of student text is no longer visible, the issue is at the heart of teaching writing and continues to be viable, even essential, for teachers to consider.

7.10. Highlighting variation between RR and AR displacements

Given that a certain degree of concurrence with regard to the overall construct has been detected and that one particular form of social action favoured, it then becomes cogent to enquire if these displacements differ, one group from the other when looked at more closely. And if so, where do the differences lie and what are they in comparing RR and AR texts?

7.10.1 Replacement revisited: primary action

To answer the above question in terms of social action it is perhaps helpful to remind ourselves of the primary action which Readers took in the Replacement dyad (see Tables 6 in 7.8) before turning to how Authors in their turn behave.

The first three categories indicated in Table 6 highlight the popularity of the actions of citing notional understanding, ideational counterclaiming and factual counterclaiming. These three actions account for 18 of the 24 approaches to Replacement and close examination of these three categories of attack reveal a certain underlying commonality of message.

Although citing a notional misunderstanding does not constitute in itself a counterclaim, it forms a solid foundation for any subsequent counterclaim realization. Like a counterclaim (factual or ideational) it delivers the message to the Author: ‘you have got it wrong.’ In the case of the counterclaim itself the message is even stronger: ‘you have got it wrong and I have got it right.’

These are perhaps among the harshest charges to make against any academics, gravely undermining as they do their stance as Primary Knowers among their peers. The fourth category – citing article deficiency, citing imperfect methodology and citing an unsubstantiated claim – is less an attack on their subject knowledge as one on their scholarly skills in terms of correct textualization and research procedures. Nevertheless, the charges continue the undermining process of the Author’s standing as credible authority in the eyes of TQ readers.

When we begin to look at the Authors’ responses, we see a similar preference for some of the actions that were so popular among Readers:

REPLACEMENT

Primary action (first line of dyad)

	Readers	Authors
Citing notional misunderstanding	7	3
Ideational counterclaim	6	7
Factual counterclaim	5	5
Citing article deficiency	3	-
Citing imperfect methodology	2	-
Citing unsubstantiated claim	1	-
Belief/practice particularizing	1	2
Approach justification	-	2
Terminological clarification	-	1
Citing goal misunderstanding	-	1

Table 8. Comparison of primary action in Readers' and Authors' Replacements

Although the frequency of certain actions was slightly different, with the citing of notional misunderstanding figuring less prominently - 3 instead of 7 times -, Authors proved to be marginally more attached to counterclaiming (whether ideationally or factually) than Readers – 12 counterclaims as opposed to 11. In other words, displacive intentions amongst Authors' texts are to all intents and purposes just as conspicuous here as amongst those of Readers. (Citing goal misunderstanding, while making only one appearance, seemed equally aimed at destabilizing Readers in the reading public's eyes as the other three categories.)

Given that the Authors' social action follow some but not all of the social action of Readers, as we have just seen, it might be helpful to establish the extent of divergence or convergence with Readers' behaviour by looking at this action under broader category headings. In this way, the broad thrust of the primary action targeted by Readers and Authors alike is more clearly evident:

		READERS	AUTHORS
Factual accuracy	This leads the writer to make a factual counterclaim with what is seen as more accurate data. A critique of factual information.	Performed	Performed
Argumentative skills	This leads the writer to make an ideational counterclaim replacing 'faulty' reasoning with a 'corrected' interpretation or accusing Reader of missing the point of the argument. A critique of argument.	Performed	Performed
Conceptual knowledge	This leads the writer to cite a notional misunderstanding. A critique of subject knowledge.	Performed	Performed
Textual consolidation	This leads the writer to render his text, terms and intentions more transparent. A defence of authorial action	_____	Performed
Research/textualization skills	This leads the writer to criticize methodology, cite unsubstantiated claim or other article deficiency. A critique of research/writing competence	Performed	_____

Table 9. Categorization of Readers' and Authors' Replacements.

In the case of three out of the four categories which Authors performed, we see them opting for social action similar to that of the Readers in the first dyad of the Replacement turn. That is to say, they attacked Reacting Readers on the grounds of

their factual accuracy, their argumentative skills and their conceptual knowledge. The fourth category of action undertaken here, however, is quite different. Since Readers have produced no article similar in scope to that of the original article, merely a commentary on it, Authors are robbed perhaps of the opportunity to query to the same extent the research/textualization skills of the Readers social action. So, for the fourth category of action performed, we see Authors turning more to measures which bring some additional transparency to their motives and intentions for their texts.

Put another way, although in the four broad categories of social action taken by Readers and Authors, there is a strong degree of convergence between Readers and Authors, differences in social role *do* bring out variation in one category. What is interesting here is that the divergence is surprisingly modest.

Where Authors differed from Readers was in their adoption of these defensive measures to make more transparent to the public their approach to the research writing process. These measures took the form of justifying their approach or practices:

AR1 ..most researchers and teachers... have used product-based approaches..... So I decided to use a process-based approach....

or refining their line of argument:

AR8 I am not denying the existence of cultural differences. But I am saying that L2 educators need to be careful.....

or taking more trouble with explaining terminology used:

AR12 I use the term not to refer to examples of good language..... but to refer to an empirically derived, theory-based construct that explains how.....

All of these manoeuvres are aimed at convincing TQ readers of the soundness of their own (Authors') views rather than demolishing here at least the somewhat 'dubious' views of Reacting Readers.

7.10.2. Secondary action in the Replacement turn: Readers

When we come to the secondary action of the Replacement dyad, we note a widening of the choice of action in both Readers and Authors. For Readers, action was split largely between positive and negative follow-through (P or N in table below). That is to say, writers chose either to be positive about their own claims or negative about those of their interlocutor:

Secondary action (second line of dyad)

Counterclaim support	5	P
Offering article 'correction'	3	P
Offering 'error' analysis	2	N
Offering notional clarification	2	P
Citing article deficiency	2	N
Offering claim weakness analysis	1	N
Citing consequence of methodological 'error'	1	N
Clarification by counterclaim	1	P
Belief/practice rebuttal	1	N
Factual counterclaim	1	P

Table 10. Secondary action in Readers' Replacements.

12 of the 19 secondary actions in the second line dyad referred to in the table above could be broadly construed as constructively positive in that they took it upon themselves to offer the reading public what they appeared to feel was a 'corrected' reading of reality. They did this by supporting their counterclaim with their own 'sound' technical detail (5), by offering a 'corrected' version of some aspect of the article (3), by offering a clarification of some notional misunderstanding by the

Author (2) and by using a counterclaim to back up a clarification they were offering (1) as well as by fielding a straightforward factual counterclaim in end position (1).

The 7 other actions identified in the second line of the dyad chose to replace parts of the Authors' texts, not with 'corrected' versions of their own, as above, but with evidence of why the Replacement was necessary. 2 offered an analysis of what they saw as 'error', 2 pointed out weaknesses in the article itself (e.g. points omitted, points confused), 1 analyzed the weakness of a certain claim, 1 harked on the dire consequences of a faulty research methodology and 1 simply rebutted the Author's beliefs/practices as being of dubious worth.

7.10.3. Secondary action in Replacement turn: Authors.

Although Authors in this second line of the Replacement dyad opted for a few secondary actions that we recognize from the Readers' approach – counterclaim support (5), offering notional clarification (1), offering 'error' analysis (1), much of what they chose to do here was new as we see from the table below.

Secondary action (second line of dyad)

	READERS	AUTHORS	
Counterclaim support	5	6	P
Offering article 'correction'	3	–	P
Offering 'error' analysis	2	1	N
Offering notional clarification	2	1	P
Citing article deficiency	2	–	N
Offering claim weakness analysis	1	–	N
Citing consequence of methodological 'error'	1	–	N
Clarification by counterclaim	1	–	P
Belief/practice rebuttal	1	–	N
Belief/practice reaffirmation	–	9	P
Factual counterclaim	1	–	P
RR reaction rejection	–	3	N
Clarification support	–	1	P

Table 11. Secondary action in Readers' and Authors' Replacements.

Perhaps most striking of all was the number of Authors who chose to round off their displacements with a return to reaffirming the beliefs and practices that had motivated them to write their article in the first place. Of the 24 actions performed by Authors here, 9 triads chose to reiterate, self-confidently, the Author's position in the face of the Readers' attempts at displacement. Some earlier had counterclaimed against their Readers' critiques and their choice of secondary action here was to provide solid counterclaim support (6).

Apart from offering a notional clarification (1), a terminological clarification (1) and a clarification support (1), the rest of their actions took on a somewhat hostile and dismissive approach to Readers' interventions.

3 actions rejected the arguments put forward in the reactions of Readers, 1 rebutted the beliefs/practices that lay behind a Reader's intervention, 1 returned to the idea of a notional misunderstanding, 1 offered an 'error' analysis and 1 was seen to be the result of the Reader totally misunderstanding what the goals the Author had set for himself. (As in Readers' table, Authors' table indicates positive or negative reaction in the face of criticism with letters P or N.)

In other words, we have here the positive/negative stance split we detected with Readers but, again, with a bias towards the positive in this secondary action. With Readers we noted that 12 of the 19 actions performed in this end position were broadly positive in that they felt they had 'corrected' in one way or another what they saw as 'error'. (See Readers' table 7.10.2.). 17 of the 22 actions performed in this position by Authors suggested that they felt they had been 'correct' all along. (See Authors' table 7.10.3.) Although dismissive actions were certainly recorded here, both parties chose to accentuate the soundness of their own stance rather than dwell on the frailty of their interlocutor's position.

In analyzing these manoeuvres, however, we cannot help but pose some awkward questions. Has such an interchange truly moved on the forum discussion? With both parties firmly entrenched in their own 'correcting' or 'correct' positions, has the cause of constructive dialogue been served? Can *both* parties be Primary

Knowers? And has the TQ public been advanced in its understanding of the issues involved? We shall return to these matters in a later chapter.

7.11. Downplaying the negative?

We remarked above that 13 of the 21 detectable displacement triads performed by Authors favoured the now familiar INR structure. What, however, of the others? Looking in detail at those displacements still to be accounted for we note that while the construct remains loosely triadic in that an Identification and a Replacement open and close the turn cycle, the Negation, while heavily implied by the co-text, is not in fact performed discretely; at least not in that part of the triad where we are by now accustomed to see it:

AR3

Identification: Liu strongly believes that my claim about the demise of method is premature.

Negation: not performed

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: Any perceptive reader of recent scholarly literature in TESOL would have noticed a new and fast emerging perspective that aims to propel L2 pedagogy beyond the limited and limiting boundaries of the traditional concept of method.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: It seems to me that, for reasons discussed in my article, the search for method has reached a dead end. I do not anticipate any new method with an entirely new set of principles and procedures emerging any time soon.

Here the basic question separating Reader and Author is basically *Is method dead?* Reader Liu clearly believes that method is not dead; Author Kumaravadivelu believes we are entering a “postmethod” era as his article title indicates: *The Postmethod Condition: (E)merging strategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching*.

While not actually performing an act of negation in either of the locations where we have come to expect it i.e. between Identification and Replacement or combined with the Identification (Type3 negation), the Author follows the Identification outlining the Reader's belief with the suggestion that *Any perceptive reader* would notice that smart researchers (Author included, no doubt) are now looking beyond method. Implication: the Reader is still preoccupied with method, therefore, the Reader does not feature among perceptive readers and by implication his claim is weakened. (There *is* a statement of negation at the very end of the triad but its object is not focused directly on the Reader's claim but on what the Author does not anticipate happening.)

We noted while looking at Type 3 negation in 7.6.3. that lexical anticipation was a useful tool in avoiding a discrete negation turn; here we see what we might call a form of lexical implicature performing a similar function. This is negation by stealth but none the less effective for its oblique approach and avoidance of a turn of discrete negation. The idea of implicature, pioneered by Grice (1975) and elaborated by Sperber and Wilson (1986) and Wilson (1994), underlines the power of the inferential to reveal what a text is 'getting at'. I describe what we are observing only as a 'form' of lexical implicature in that Wilson (1994) insists that, although every utterance has a variety of possible interpretations, relevance rules out all interpretations except one, relying largely on the 'contextual effect' (and 'processing effort') (Wilson 1994:45) to make this clear. Here, although we cannot be *entirely* certain that only one interpretation is possible, the distinctly displacive context surrounding these

comments is such that the ‘contextual effect’ alerts the reader to the strong implication of negation, who then processes the comments in the light of the context.

A rather different kind of example where an act of direct negation is also avoided is to be found in AR2:

AR2

Identification: Some of Oxford and Green’s comments reflect different assumptions about the merits of different research styles.

Negation: not performed

REPLACEMENT

Approach justification: Ethnographic research data collection and analysis techniques document patterns of values, attitudes, and/or behavior across a particular sociocultural community. Use of these techniques ensures both the validity (credibility) and reliability (dependability) of the study. Rather than assume generalization across social and cultural settings, ethnographic research reports allow for readers to determine possible transfer of findings to other situations.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: Thus, what I have found through ethnographic means provides equally valid evidence which, together with the SILL results, may help us to better understand what learners in a different learning environment from that of North America do.

Here, again, the approach is non-confrontational. While the Readers’ research methods are not directly attacked or rejected, there is a robust defence of the Author’s own ethnographic approach which is put forward ostensibly as being complementary to the quantitative methods used to determine SILL results. There *is* however, a not-so-veiled swipe at quantitative methods in *Rather than assume generalization across social and cultural settings, ethnographic research reports allow.....* The implication here is that SILL methods do *not* allow freedom from generalizations, but that implied statement of negation is deflected into praise for complementary methods and the lurking act of direct negation avoided.

AR3, which we have already looked at, provides another example of the non-performed negation:

Identification: The second concern of Liu's is that my strategic framework is only an addition, not an alternative, to method.

Negation: not performed

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: He has interpreted my work exclusively in classical methodological terms, whereas the very purpose of my article is to show that there are alternative ways of approaching L2 teaching.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: Unlike traditional methods, the strategic framework is theory natural, that is, not constrained by any one specific theory of language, learning or teaching... My article presents a case for restructuring teacher education so that prospective/practicing teachers can be provided with the knowledge, skill, and autonomy necessary to generate their own location-specific, classroom-oriented innovative macro/microstrategies.

Here we have yet again an apparently negation-free triad, yet there is a strong underlying rebuttal to be detected between the lines. In the Replacement turn we hear the Author complaining that the Reader has missed *the very purpose of my article* which clearly allows him to place the said Reader amongst the unperceptive and in the final line of the Replacement dyad the *raison d'être* of the article is once again heavily spelled out for those who missed the point the first time i.e. the Reacting Reader in question. The lexical dice are loaded against those traditionalists in favour of method: "*Unlike traditional methods*, the strategic framework is *not constrained*... My article presents a case for restructuring teacher educationto generate... *innovative macro/microstrategies*" Constraint is associated with the limitations of tradition, the strategic framework provides innovation. The Reader has missed this point; his argument is rejected. The implication is that his reading of reality is narrow and that forward-thinkers in the profession would do well to accord their consensus to the Author.

Negativity of vision is again imputed to the Reacting Reader in AR6.

Identification: Whereas Schlessman warns that teachers' sense-making "risks being anti-intelligent,"

Negation: not performed

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: I believe teachers' sense-making is enormously powerful in transforming their understandings of why they teach the way they do and in empowering them to change their practices as they see fit.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: If we as L2 teacher educators continue to deny the inequalities that exist between theory and practice, we will continue to devalue the ways in which teachers make sense of what they know and do.

Here the Author's view of teachers' *sense-making* is that it is *enormously powerful* in its capacity for *empowering* them; her upbeat view of teacher's sense-making contrasts sharply with the denial of this by the Reader. Continue to think in this negative way, the Author warns, and we will *devalue the ways in which teachers make sense of what they know and do*. And who, the unspoken question whispers to a readership largely made up of one sort of teacher or another, would be in favour of such treatment of the profession? No rejection is overtly made, but the call to collegial consensus behind the Author's positive viewpoint effectively isolates the Reader in her negative perspective on the issue.

The same technique of isolating rather than confronting the Reader's negativity by drawing attention to the Author's constructive, open-minded perspective is apparent in a displacement from AR1:

Identification: {He writes} that I am bent upon resurrecting and continuing the process/product split.

Negation: not performed

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim:.. I am committed, in this article as well as in other writing I have published, to demonstrating that process and product exist along a continuum and that a concentration on either can make learning to write more difficult for students.

Counterclaim support: The false dichotomy between the two that I define in my article has not only been written to death but has had a negative effect on ESL writing research.

Here and in the other 6 examples of this technique in AR texts, we are witnessing negation by curious and subtle means. By amassing substantial positive

value to their own positions, Authors effectively destabilize the opposing views by making them appear narrow, backward-looking or misguided by contrast.

Not all Authors applied this technique, nor did those who favoured it use it to the exclusion of the more traditionally formulated displacement triad that we have come to recognize. Why, however, Authors should regularly have availed themselves of this technique rather than Readers is difficult to determine precisely. Did they feel that their status as TQ published Authors allowed them – or required them even – to adopt from time to time a stance and tone which avoided direct nay-saying, rather in the way that teachers avoid telling pupils that they have ‘got it wrong’, preferring to promote what they see as their own sounder views? Or was it a way of dealing with criticism in a public forum, by seeming to rise above the temptation to become too frequently involved in public nay-saying, preferring to ride above it some of the time and sideline their critics by emphasizing the positive, progressive and tolerant nature of their own stance and at the same time manoeuvring Readers to appear unhelpfully contrary.

Whatever the motivation for the use of this technique, its occasional use brought a certain Olympian tone to parts of Authors’ texts. The overpowering strength of their positive vision seemed to put them above the need – or desire – to put down *directly* every view that conflicted with their own, or so such a tone might be interpreted. There might superficially appear to be a downplaying of negation in that overt Negation turns of the kind we saw earlier are avoided, but there is no gainsaying the power of such displacements.

7.12. Article referrals

What was of interest in the AR counterclaiming Replacements was the split between those Replacements which, like RR Replacements, simply counterclaimed with the appropriate support and those which drew attention to sentiments voiced in the original article and, indeed, the article itself as part of that claim (5 instances):

AR1

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: ...I am committed, in this article as well as in other writing I have published, to demonstrating that process and product exist along a continuum and that a concentration on either can make learning to write more difficult for students.

Counterclaim support: The false dichotomy between the two that I define in my article has not only been written to death but has had a negative effect on ESL writing research.

AR3

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: Any perceptive reader of recent scholarly literature in TESOL would have noticed a new and fast emerging perspective that aims to propel L2 pedagogy beyond the limited and limiting boundaries of the traditional concept of method.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: It seems to me that, for reasons discussed in my article, the search for method has reached a dead end. I do not anticipate any new method with an entirely new set of principles and procedures emerging any time soon.

AR3

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: He has interpreted my work exclusively in classical methodological terms, whereas the very purpose of my article is to show that there are alternative ways of approaching L2 teaching.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: Unlike traditional methods, the strategic framework is theory natural, that is, not constrained by any one specific theory of language, learning or teaching...

My article presents a case for restructuring teacher education so that prospective/practicing teachers can be provided with the knowledge, skill, and autonomy necessary to generate their own location-specific, classroom-oriented innovative macro/microstrategies.

AR12

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: My comments were based not on an assumption but on research

Counterclaim support: (including good empirical studies being carried out by my own doctoral students into the effectiveness of self-access learning) supporting the value of having a professional language teacher to support learning in classrooms and in self-access contexts.

AR12

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Where would these researchers get the money to carry out the research? Why should public money be spent on this (even assuming the money was available) when the authors and publishers are making such large profits?

Belief/practice reaffirmation: I suggested that TESOL as the field's professional organization, and as one committed to protecting the interests of language learners everywhere, should set standards for the test preparation industry, partly because of the economic truth that only a large professional body can afford to do so and partly because accreditation by TESOL, should a test preparation text achieve it, would be a strong (and marketable) affirmation of quality.

Here we witness Authors availing themselves of a certain edge by reminding the TQ reading public of their status as published authors in the field's leading refereed journal. The appeal to have their claim (or rather counterclaim) 'accepted above all opposition' (Hunston 1993:116) is subtly being promoted not solely on the reasoned rationale of their Forum text but also on a timely reminder of earlier published authority. Without giving undue prominence to this manoeuvre, we cannot help but note its quiet usefulness in amassing persuasive force to the Authors' version of reality.

7.13.Rhetorical resonance

Also reflecting the published authority weight of the Author is a predilection for the final line of the Replacement dyad to take the form of what we are calling the reaffirmation of belief or practice as voiced in the original TQ article.

Looking back to RR texts, we heard a tone in the final section of the Replacement turn which was often convincing in its appeal to *technical detail*:

RR4

REPLACEMENT

Citing unsubstantiated claims: Thus, she argues that "if learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wide range of symbolic and material resources" (p.17). She adds, "learners will expect or hope to have a good return on that investment" and further that "this return on investment must be seen as commensurate

with the effort expended on learning the second language” (p.17). There is no suggestion this a priori calculative rationality directing investment changes across cultures and over time. That is, it is not constructed in discourse but is an inherent quality of all human subjects. This is a very contentious claim and yet central to Peirce’s argument. The assumption of such a given, rational subject has been a central object of criticism by much poststructural and critical thinking alike.

Offering claim weakness analysis: I am suggesting that on the one hand Peirce resorts to a pre-given subject-agent, yet on the other argues that “subjectivity is produced in a variety of social sites, all of which are structured by relations of power” (p.15). The place of the subject-agent needs further clarification, especially if the dissolution of agency into social/discourse determinism is to be avoided.

Peirce deals with agency simply by asserting “the subject has human agency” and that consequently “the subject positions a subject takes up within a particular discourse are open to argument” (p.15) by the subject. However, whether the subject who resists does so according to interests and faculties that are discourse mediated or pre-given remains very unclear.

Here, in the AR texts, however, there is a tendency (9 examples from 15 texts) for a belief/practice reaffirmation to end the triad. Here the focus appears to be less on technical detail than on philosophical reflection. Summative in intention and often sonorous in tone, these reaffirmations of belief are strong on rhetorical resonance with an appeal that is to the ear as much as to the brain. Typical of this is the following:

AR6 REPLACEMENT

Counterclaim: Not only is theory prized over practice, but those who construct theory are generally held in higher esteem than and hold positions of power over those who conduct practice.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: This situation is not the result of “artificial distinctions” or “problematic dualisms”; it is reality, and as such the inequalities between theory and practice continue to exact a hefty payment from those who conduct practice.

With *This situation is not.../it is reality* we have the Ciceronian appeal of the balanced sentence, lulling its readers into consensus not only by means of its seemingly sharp-sighted pragmatism but also by its ability to sculpt oratorically resonant cadences that are clearly meant to sweep readers along in their wake.

Similarly musical and rhetorically balanced in its appeal is the *If we as L2*

teachers continue to deny... we will continue to devalue of AR6:

REPLACEMENT

Counterclaim: I believe teachers' sense-making is enormously powerful in transforming their understandings of why they teach the way they do and in empowering them to change their practices as they see fit.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: If we as L2 teacher educators continue to deny the inequalities that exist between theory and practice, we will continue to devalue the ways in which teachers make sense of what they know and do.

Less rhetorically florid perhaps but equally wedded to the balanced sentence – this

time around the idea of eye and heart - is AR1 in the final line of the dyad:

REPLACEMENT

Counterclaim: Despite the fact that the discussion of the issue has all but disappeared from the research literature, I still see the question of response to and possible appropriation of student text as central to the whole enterprise of teaching writing..... Whereas Hall may well have come to terms with the issues and feels content with the way he deals with response to student writing, I continue to struggle with this issue , and I think that many teachers also struggle to balance “teacherly” instruction with student learning.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: Thus, I believe that although the research discussion on appropriation of student text is no longer visible, the issue is at the heart of teaching writing and continues to be viable, even essential, for teachers to consider.

Equally wedded to the rhetorical *Thus*, of AR1 is the reaffirmatory second line of the

Replacement dyad of AR2:

REPLACEMENT

Approach justification: Ethnographic research data collection and analysis techniques document patterns of values, attitudes, and/or behavior across a particular sociocultural community. Use of these techniques ensures both the validity (credibility) and reliability (dependability) of the study. Rather than assume generalization across social and cultural settings, ethnographic research reports allow for readers to determine possible transfer of findings to other situations.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: Thus, what I have found through ethnographic means provides equally valid evidence which, together with the SILL results, may help us to better understand what learners in a different learning environment from that of North America do.

In these final moments of AR triads the emphasis seems not so much to be on detailed critical analysis and synthesis (as encountered in the 'corrective' action of RR triads) but rather on philosophical and rhetorical summation.

7.14. The Reader, the Author and displacive intentions

Standing back for a moment to look at the behaviour of both Readers and Authors in these central sections of the text, we are struck by the commonality of general structural approach, the broadly similar displacive strategies of Readers and Authors alike uniting a certain diversity of specific sociocognitive tactics.

The perception shared by Reader and Author alike of the usefulness of the displacement triad established a strong intertextual link between the two sets of texts. At the higher level of textual organization, the INR turn sequence seemed to be a privileged construct for both in their attempts to assure displacement, consensus and ultimately ascendancy. The 24 examples of this triadic structure identified among RR texts and the 21 among AR texts point to the popularity of this schema for achieving these ends.

Within this formal construct, however, the variations were considerable, affecting each turn of the triad.

The Identification turn may have appeared perhaps least subject to variation of the three, but this was not always the case. Generally speaking, it launched the issue for discussion and set the scene for the subsequent action. Negative evaluation, however, crept into Identification 8 times in Readers' texts and 4 times in Authors'

texts to formulate what we called Type 3 Negation. The handling of Negation was one of the more intriguing aspects of the triad.

Type 3 Negation, as we said above, was favoured much more by Readers than by Authors. Here, by inserting items such as *problem* or *confusion* into the Identification, writers looked to lexical anticipation to avoid performing discrete acts of negation. The unpacking of such items de facto leads to, if not a discrete act of negation, at least a commentary that is ultimately unfavourable to the recipient. Authors used yet another technique to avoid discrete acts of negation. In 8 of their 21 triads they avoided such acts by resorting not so much to items of lexical anticipation in the Identification as to items lexically *implying* negation in the Replacement i.e. phrases such as *Any perceptive reader of recent scholarly literature in TESOL would have noticed.....* . Here a discrete act of negation is avoided but the negative implication with regard to the Reader and his perception is abundantly clear.

Taken together with their 4 examples of Type 3 negation, these 8 instances of negation by implication revealed Authors 12 times out of 21 to be keen to avoid direct nay-saying. Readers, by contrast, showed less reluctance in saying 'no' discretely. 16 of the 24 displacement triads had no hesitation in performing directly acts of negation.

Negation, then, found Readers and Authors diverging in their approach. Did the less overt nay-saying mean that Authors took up a less negative stance to criticism than Readers? Superficially, this might have appeared to be the case but the illocutionary force of Authors' apparently less confrontational handling of this turn

seemed, if diluted, certainly not weakened - and perhaps even strengthened - by these subtler means of undermining Readers' propositions.

Replacement, however, revealed lesser divergence of action by Readers and Authors. Although the secondary action found in the final line of the Replacement dyad showed considerable variation, three out of the four categories of action in the first line of the Replacement turn revealed Readers and Authors alike accusing the other of failures in factual accuracy, argumentative skills and conceptual knowledge. Although the broad thrust of the secondary action of the Replacement turn emphasized more the 'rightness' of writers rather than the 'wrongness' of their interlocutors, the means to achieve this were various. So myriad were the actions and combinations of actions here that it is difficult to draw a general picture of these means. Readers, however, often favoured detailed 'chapter-and-verse' arguments in their Replacement turns, with considerable appeal to authority; Authors preferred to insist on the soundness of their previously demarcated positions which they tended to argue with rhetorical fluency and philosophical confidence rather than with recourse to new information.

With Readers insisting on the soundness of their 'corrective' intervention and Authors standing by the 'correctness' of their original propositions, the public airing of the issue would appear to have advanced the academic debate very little, if, indeed, at all.

7.15. Cognitive processing or cognitive structuring?

Turning a moment from these sociocognitive actions to the displacement triad constructs themselves, we are obliged to consider their status in the context of the text as a whole.

One of the tasks I set myself in approaching this study was to ascertain if, and to what extent, this collection of texts belonged to either a genre or sub-genre. Having looked in some detail at the text processes performed we must ask ourselves if these processes are genre-specific in their communicative purpose and organization. Swales (1990: 88) reminds us that it is in the nature of genres to coalesce *what* is sayable with *when* and *how* it is sayable. Here we might do well to pause and consider the implications of this statement for the texts we have examined. Looking at the text processes we have isolated, could we label them as belonging to a specific text-type or discourse community? To what extent, if at all, do the *whats*, the *whens* and the *hows* of our examples coalesce identifiably into the property of a readily recognizable genre?

While we have seen sufficient evidence in the opening moves of our texts (and shall see more in the closing move discussed in Chapter 8) to be able to state confidently that we are witnessing a discourse community embarking on and then terminating a readily identifiable professional event, the processes we have seen underpinning the central sections of these texts seem rather more reluctant to demonstrate an affiliation to any specific genre.

What we have been looking at are not so much genre-specific organizational moves but rather mini-displacive schemata that could fit other categories of spoken or written discourse. Bhatia (1993:32) reminds us that:

Cognitive structuring in a genre is the property of the genre as such and not that of the individual reader.

Schemata are free of such localized ownership. For de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:90) schemata are 'global patterns' which join frames and plans in being stored mentally

..because of their usefulness in many tasks.

Following Royer (1977) they propose the theory of 'reconstruction' which

..entails using one's stored schemas (or frames or plans etc) in their current state to reconstruct some presentation encountered in the past.

Here the past encounter being reconstructed in these triads is an act of displacement realized through Identification, Negation and Replacement turns in the various forms discussed earlier in this chapter. This is an act which is far from being genre- or discourse community-specific. In schema theory, the cognitive aspects of text processing take precedence over identifying overall textual mission, as Swales suggests:

..the schema theorist's emphasis on cognition has tended to isolate the text from its communicative purpose and from its environment. (1990:88)

Schemata alone, in Swales' opinion,

..reflect a microcosmic cognitive world dangerously adrift from communicative purpose and discoursal context. (1990:91)

How far the displacement triad can drift from the intertextual critical exchange into other contextual waters forms the substance of the following section.

7.15.1. Lauren Bacall and the displacement triad

On Thursday, 8th September 2004 a press-conference was held at the Venice Film Festival. A report of it appeared in the “Daily Telegraph” the following day.

Lauren Bacall, questioned about her work with Nicole Kidman, replied displacively. As written up by the journalist, the journalist/Bacall interchange appeared as a displacement triad identical to the kind we have been looking at.

Identification: “And now you’ve worked alongside another screen legend, Nicole Kidman...”

Non-concessive negation: “She’s not a legend,” she replied.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: “She’s a beginner.

Counterclaim support: What is this ‘legend’? She can’t be a legend at whatever age she is. She can’t be a legend, you have to be older.”

Here we have a spontaneous oral interchange subsequently transposed to written text which falls into one of the same displacive schemata that we have been studying. A further example of a displacement triad from a very different milieu and time-frame can be found in a speech of Adolf Hitler in a translation taken from the internet. (www.adolfhitler.ws/lib/speeches) Talking in Dusseldorf on 27th January 1932, he remarked:

Identification: I regard it as of the first importance to break once and for all with the view that our destiny is conditioned by world events.

Non-concessive negation: It is not true that our distress has its final cause in a world crisis, in a world catastrophe:

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: the true view is that we have reached a state of general crisis because from the first certain mistakes were made.

Counterclaim support: I must not say ‘According to the general view the Peace Treaty of Versailles is the cause of our misfortune.’ What is the Peace Treaty of Versailles but the work of men? It is not a burden which has been imposed or laid upon us by Providence. It is the work of men for which, it goes without saying, once again men with their merits or their failings must be held responsible. I am of the opinion that there is nothing which has been produced by the will of man which cannot in its turn be altered by another human will.

It is perhaps doubtful if Lauren Bacall (or rather her reporting journalist) and Adolf Hitler were aware of expressing themselves in displacement triads embedded in longer stretches of discourse, but this unquestionably is what they are doing in these extracts. The displacement triad we have identified here is clearly common to the language of debate and argument, whether it be in spheres as diverse as 21st century film-festival press-conferences or 20th century political demagoguery: the Identification identifies for the listener/reader the issue(s) which the speaker/writer is about to isolate for discussion; the Negation seeks to manoeuvre the listener/reader away from the views towards the issue(s) expressed by an earlier writer/speaker by raising question(s) with regard to the reliability of these views; the Replacement gives either the speaker/writer's replacement statement and/or his/her grounds of displacement.

By examining the realizations of these INR triads, we cannot confidently say in whose discourse community we find ourselves. The community here is one of displacive discourse, but the discourse of rival claims is not unique to intertextual critical exchanges. These triads are neither genre- or community-specific, but the property of all who participate in the world of contentious debate.

The conventionalized and standardized organization we saw in structuring the opening and closing moves belonged recognizably to the discourse associated with intertextual critical exchanges; the multi-formatted displacive schemata we have seen operating in this section enjoy a microcosmic integrity but play no specific part in a larger, recognizably genre-specific rhetorical pattern. These can – and do – slot into the texts where and when the writer chooses without any sense of slight to global

rhetorical structure, for they are operating in the pattern-free sector of these central sections of our texts. Cognitive structuring in a genre, Bhatia (1993:32) reminds us, “is the property of the genre as such and not that of the individual reader.” What we have seen here are sections of the texts organized as displacive schemata assembled according to writer-selected choices and permutations of choices rather than genre-specific organizational patterns. In answer to the question posed in the title of this section, we are witnessing cognitive processing rather than cognitive structuring at work. In other words, after opting for what we have seen to be fairly conventionalized community behaviour in the opening sections of the texts (and shall see again in the closing move), Readers and Authors alike revert in the central sections to a freer response dictated by idiosyncratic personal schematic preferences reconstructed from memories of past displacive encounters rather than driven by community-recognized generic practices.

8. ANALYZING THE TEXTS: Closing the discussion

Before embarking on a discussion of how Readers and Authors terminate their discussion, we should perhaps ask how we *know* a termination is on its way, apart from the obvious answer to that. There are certain texts which obligingly signal this overtly. A number choose to set a section aside and head it 'Conclusion'; others make use of other surface linguistic signals such as 'To conclude,..', 'In sum,..', 'Finally,..' to indicate that the end is in sight. Such lexical indicators appear in 12 texts. A more frequent indicator of the writer preparing to close the discussion is the appearance of one of the two exit moves with their various concomitant steps which form the basis of the discussion in the following sections.

Text	Termination indicator
AR3, RR4, RR6, RR10	Section heading of <i>CONCLUSION</i>
AR2	Termination indicator: <i>To conclude,</i>
RR7, AR15	Termination indicator: <i>In conclusion,</i>
RR9	Termination indicator: <i>In the end,</i>
RR15	Termination indicator: <i>In sum,</i>
AR1, RR12	Termination indicator: <i>Finally,</i>
AR7	Termination indicator: <i>A final question to ponder</i>

Table 12. Termination signalling behaviour

Before exploring in detail how Readers and Authors variously approach this section of the text, we note that here, as elsewhere, (despite the local divergences we have previously indicated in chapters six and seven), a certain commonality of purpose unites Reacting Reader and Responding Author. The purpose in the past has been to be accorded Primary Knower status, as, indeed, it is here, too. But added to this ambition is one with which this ambition is intimately linked and which we have not previously observed. It would perhaps be overstating the case to suggest that Readers and Authors see themselves grandiosely as ‘guardians of the future’, yet it is true to say that in these closing moves, along with the desire to be accorded discursual ascendancy, the beacon of the future looms large in the minds of Readers and Authors alike. How exactly they view that future, their role in it and its effect on their text-construction we shall see later.

We look first at how Reacting Readers prepare to exit the discussion.

8.1. Reacting Reader exit strategy.

By the time the TQ reader arrives at the realization of the RR’s text exit strategy, it is by now more than clear where Readers stand in their evaluation of the original article. The text takes on much of the feel of that part of a piece of music as it prepares for the finale, known within the musical world as the coda. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a coda is:

a passage...introduced after the completion of the essential parts of a movement, so as to form a more definite and satisfactory conclusion.

The ‘essential parts’ i.e. the evaluative considerations of the original text are now almost complete. Readers, however, still mindful of the need to create the most convincing case at all times, need to bow out of the text in a way which forms their own ‘definite and satisfactory conclusion’ by underlining their persuasive abilities and confirming their informed status in the eyes of the reading public.

Certain texts, recalling Entry Move 1, achieve this by a return to a gesture of seeming politeness before reasserting their confidence in their propositions, i.e. they make a concession to the Author’s stance before asserting Primary Knower status; many more pin their belief on the need for arrogating to themselves – unhedged - Primary Knower status.

We identify the exit moves and their attendant steps as follows:

8.1.1. Exit Moves

Move 1A	Reaffirming concessively Primary Knower status
	or
Move 1B	Reaffirming non-concessively Primary Knower status

The following table identifies the choices made by those texts performing this move.

CLOSING MOVES	Move 1A	Move 1B
RR1		X
RR2		X
RR3		X
RR4	X	
RR6		X
RR7	X	
RR8		X
RR9		X
RR10		X
RR11	X	
RR12		X
RR13		X
RR14		X
RR15		X

Table 13. Reacting Reader exit move pattern

8.2. Move 1A Reaffirming concessively Primary Knower status.

In the realization of Move 1A we are reminded of Thompson and Zhou's (2000:130) comments vis a vis concessions and assertions which we first encountered when discussing displacement triads earlier:

In a case of a concession, of course, it is the writer who is simultaneously accepting the truth of a proposition and in a way calling it into question in relation to the following dominant assertion.

The truth of this observation seems to be borne out in the codas below where we feel the 'concession' (in my italics) is merely a retreat for a better positioned attack:

RR4 *Although the practical suggestions Peirce makes in the last section of her article seem of great value*, I have questioned how far they respond to and grow out of issues raised by poststructural thought and how far her argument does in fact integrate the language learner

and language learning context. I have questioned how far Peirce moves beyond the concept of a unitary subject. I have argued that her concern with resistance, power, and silence rests ultimately on an appeal to individual capacities and does not explore far enough the way the individual subject/learner is implicated in social and discourse practices. If attention is directed more to the radical contingency of subject identity, interests, and desires (and rationality), which are formed within discourse practices; if this is the focus of attention, then from an SLA perspective, the ways in which learners respond to the specificity of discourses and take up positions and the ways in which resistance itself can be grounded in such practices will take on greater prominence and urgency.

RR7 In conclusion, *I am not questioning Silva's ability to teach an ESL/EFL composition class effectively and ethically*, although his concept of appropriate instruction is apparently far different from my own. *Over the years he may have developed a style of teaching and a writing course content that work well for him in his situation.* However, I think it is unhelpful of him to imply that those of us who often assign comprehensive course work themes and specific writing topics as essential components of our writing course curricula are somehow less ethical than he is.

As ESL/EFL teachers living in a multicultural world, we probably experience the implications of this more directly than others. Because our personalities, our students, and our working conditions are apt to be different, we should recognize that our teaching methods may also need to be different.

RR11 *By no means do I intend to criticize Smitherman's conclusion that educators need to account for their students' language differences* both in setting educational policy and in creating and implementing effective classroom teaching methods. *Nor do I disagree with her contention* that the educational needs of African American students in urban schools are not always best served. However, by using inaccurate statistical analysis to support her points, Smitherman detracts from their forcefulness and provides a convenient basis for those who disagree with her conclusions to simply dismiss them. Particularly when accurate information is both in the public domain and easily obtainable, it is inexcusable to misstate the facts.

In terms of social action, we see all three texts, the concession completed, making criticisms of one kind or another and two of them concluding with an affirmation of their beliefs. In RR4, the Author's intellectual standpoint is criticized before the Reader foregrounds his own stance. RR7 concludes with a similar stance indication, but not before mounting something of a personal criticism of the Author. The third text RR11 chooses the path of criticizing the Author personally for slovenly scholarship. Whatever formal concessions are made, the Reader clearly adopts the

scholarly high ground belonging to the Primary Knower aggrieved by such imprecision in a colleague.

Move 1A Reaffirming concessively Primary Knower status

Step1 by
Reaffirming belief
and/or
Step2 Making criticisms

Move 1A	Step 1	Step 2
	Reaffirming belief	Making criticisms
RR4	x	x
RR7	x	x
RR11		x

Table 14. Reacting Reader exit Move 1A

In terms of text construction we see clearly how concession exponents help form the structural foundation for the final undermining of the Author's position. In RR4, the concessive 'although' clause is the trigger mechanism for the parallel structures 'I have questioned' (2) and 'I have argued' which form the backbone of much of the Reader's final stance. In RR7 the Reader does *not* question the Author's perception for 'he{the Author} may well have developed' a style and course content that work for him. These concessions, however, are the structural springboard for the change of critical direction embedded in the upcoming 'However,' which heralds a fairly sweeping repudiation of the Author's position. As in RR7, RR11 also makes structural play of negation markers (more strongly than in RR7) "By no means do I intend to criticize Smitherman's conclusion....' and 'Nor do I disagree with her contention that..." Overall, nevertheless, there is the shadow of the hovering 'However' which, as in RR7, triumphs over the earlier denial of disagreement and sweeps the text on into wholly negative territory.

Rhetorically, this concessive nod to Author claim reveals, as in Entry Move 1 Step 1, the Reader's awareness of the reading community's presence over her/his shoulder. For by appearing to be the fair-minded arbiter of rival claims, s/he may well win kudos for even-handedness – and thereby help win the reading public's vote of preferred 'Primary Knower'. But it also, in the opinion of Thompson and Zhou (2000), helps call into question the information in the concession itself, as we noted in Chapter 7 when discussing concessive negation.

As, too, in Entry Move 1 Step 1, we note that this gesture of seeming politeness is less than whole-hearted. In RR4, as previously indicated, it emerges rather vaguely. In RR11 negative constructions are highlighted and in RR7, the modal 'may' significantly qualifies the style of teaching allowed to the Author ('Over the years he may have developed a style of teaching...' but, then again, he may *not* have is the unspoken corollary.)

All in all, here, as at the beginning of the RR texts, positive seeming elements are not always what they seem, but rather either a firm structural platform for upcoming criticism, a rhetorical attempt to establish a receptive relationship with Forum readers or even an oblique questioning of the truth value contained therein 'by denial of the consequences that might be expected to follow from it.' (Thompson and Zhou 2000:130) Beyond the concession lies the incontrovertible information – incontrovertible at least in Readers' eyes - that their ideational and factual information claims are to be preferred over those of the Author.

8.3. Move 1B

Reaffirming non-concessively Primary Knower status.

We note that in 11 of the 15 texts Readers recapitulate in the text's closing moments their non-concessive assertion of their posited status as 'Primary Knower'. But by exactly what steps do they consolidate Move 1B? On what grounds are their claims to be Primary Knowers based?

This self-assumed status would appear to prompt the Reader to favour one of three steps: to make recommendations of alternative ideas/practices to those advocated by the Author; to assert their own beliefs definitively; to make a final counterclaim against ideas/principles held by the Author. (We shall see later that more than one of these steps may appear to back up Primary Knower claims.)

The most popular of these steps is one which deals with our observation in the introduction to this chapter – that of the writer's preoccupation with the future, for the step of making recommendations is one where suggestions for future behaviour are proposed. We look first at this step before discussing the alternative choices.

Move 1B	Reaffirming non-concessively Primary Knower status
---------	--

	by
Step1	Making recommendations
	and/or
Step 2	Reaffirming belief
	and/or
Step3	Summative counterclaiming

Move 1B	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	Making recommendations	Reaffirming belief	Summative counterclaiming
RR1	(x)	x	
RR2	x		
RR3	x		(x)
RR6	(x)	x	
RR8			x
RR9	(x)	x	
RR10	x		(x)
RR12	x		(x)
RR13	x		
RR14	x		
RR15			x

Table 15. Reacting Reader exit Move 1B

8.3.1. Step 1 Making recommendations

No less than 6 texts rounded off the discussion with a show of confidence in the Reader's ability to make recommendations, usually on how community practice or understanding could be improved by adopting the Reader's perspective, almost always in preference to that of the Author.

Some texts had limited recommendations to make; others tabled lists.

Amongst the former we have RR3:

If Kumaradivelu's strategic framework does encompass these procedures/techniques/skills (included perhaps in his *microstrategies*, though we do not know that because he gives no definition or real illustration of his microstrategies), he then should revise both his claim of a "postmethod condition" and his proposal of a strategic framework as an "alternative to method". Rather than a postmethod condition, it should be a "method redefining condition", and instead of being an "alternative to" method, the strategic framework should be an "addition to" method, or to be more accurate, it should be a framework subsuming method.

Although listed under 'Making recommendations', this example well illustrates the fact that genre steps may at times overlap or set up echoes of other steps. The "If

Kumaradivelu's strategic framework does..., he then should...'structure firmly places this extract in the 'Making recommendations' camp but the echo of a counterclaim persists in its alternative vision of best practice. (Steps where this overlap of intentions are observable are indicated in brackets.) Similarly concise in its frame of recommendation is RR12. Like RR3, too, an echo of counterclaim is to be detected:

Given these conditions neither of the students' choosing nor of the material writers' making, we question whether the solution is to call in the TESOL regulators, mandate classroom instruction (or books designed for the classroom), and issue teaching licenses to TOEFL preparation instructors. A better approach, we suggest, may be to critically educate students as to which materials are the most accurate, representative, and appropriate for their own interests and to encourage and empower them in achieving their own educational goals.

In RR13 the Reader has recommendations to make but here, rarely, not directly in conflict with the views of the Author (although there has been much in her text that has been critical):

The exploration of critical pedagogy must move from principles to materials, lesson plans, classroom activities, assessment tools, and course designs.

Crawford-Lange's (1981) 20 principles outline a framework and approach that may be useful. She states, "This concern for critical thinking is neither foreign nor objectionable to most educators. However, to truly make it the primary concern, some alterations must take place in classroom approaches and activities" (pp.259-260). In the same vein, I hope that Crookes and Lehner's application of critical pedagogy to teacher education will inspire others to further these pursuits in language classrooms, conduct participatory action research projects, address issues raised within a critical pedagogical orientation, and report their findings in ways that can be modeled in other language classroom settings.

Here the attitude is less overtly confrontational. The Reader's claim to Primary Knower status does not depend on opposing the Authors' views but by saying that they must be extended and 'move from principles' (as laid down by Crookes and Lehner) to 'materials, lesson plans, classroom activities, assessment tools, and course designs' (as detailed by the Reader). If progress is to be made, the Reader implies, then her recommendation of a move from the abstract principles of the Authors to her own more 'hands on' approach will be necessary.

Far more confrontational are the recommendations made in RR2. Interestingly, although the recommendations are ultimately aimed at safeguarding community research practice (if we refer quickly to the last two lines), we might be forgiven for thinking that these are recommendations aimed specifically at what are seen by the Readers as hopeless inadequacies in the Author's approach to research:

We have four suggestions, which overlap somewhat. First, it would have been helpful if LoCastro had done her basic homework about the purposes of the SILL before using the instrument (see especially Oxford, 1990, p.199 and appendices). We cannot expect any data gathering technique – interview, summative rating scale, diary, think aloud – to serve all conceivable purposes. Researchers need to be concerned with why various techniques were designed and to choose the one technique (or several) suitable to specific needs.

Second, if conducting a study in a rather new and rapidly evolving ESL/EFL area such as language learning strategies, the researcher's very first step should be to contact earlier investigators and try to obtain up-to-date information that has been published round the world (or that has been completed and is in press). Even a minor attempt at cooperative interchange would have provided LoCastro with abundant information.

Third, incomplete and imprecise research reporting, in the confusion about vocabulary strategies and the untruth regarding a supposed absence of strategies involving listening on the SILL should not be tolerated, particularly when investigators worldwide are trying to create a solid foundation for language learning strategy research.

Fourth, in our opinion, even rather brief reports of research in progress should be published with adequate citation of existing research. Lack of such citation results in inaccuracies, as we have seen.

We hope these recommendations will enable others to avoid the conceptual and methodological pitfalls exhibited in the LoCastro piece.

Only in these last two lines do the Readers, somewhat self-righteously, attempt to turn their piece into something more constructive than an attack on the Author - which it has appeared to be throughout. By dint of recommending to the research community how research should be conducted, they unequivocally snatch the title of Primary Knower for themselves.

Equally confident in his status as Primary Knower is the writer of RR14 who, like the text above, also favours listing recommendations:

I suggest that, apart from the existing concern with categories of tests, the testing/assessment community could do the following as major concerns:

1. Identify different objectives in schools in different language learning contexts (Genssee & Upshur, 1996, chap.3)
2. Clarify possible overall assessment systems, their principles, and their consequences, ranging from.....
3. Consider different abilities to be assessed and the tasks that might be implemented along with their specific purposes....
4. Consider differing criteria for assessing different types of task. For example,....
5. Confront the question of how to balance or weight the assessment of progress, of effort, and of attainment (ability) across different tasks.
6. Discuss the question of using similar tasks for learning and practice and as minitests. All such tasks could be included in a portfolio, for example, but some might not be.

These concerns, I think, are more than enough to be getting on with.

As Primary Knower, the Reader is setting the record straight as to what should be done with regard to testing and assessment not only for the benefit of the Authors (who had failed in this area in the Reader's eyes) but for 'the testing/assessment community' as a whole.

Before leaving RR texts which make recommendations we need to look at RR10 which, although it avoids making direct recommendations, suggests a close variant on this approach. This text points out that an unfortunate situation will remain without redress until certain obstacles are removed – and then proceeds to list these obstacles:

In the perfect world, LPP is how language minority students should be integrated into the school community: Newcomers arrive, they learn the necessary knowledge and skills by actually engaging in the practices of the community, and in time they, too, become experts and fully-fledged members of the community. But in reality this process is compromised because (a) language minority students are systematically denied access to resources they need to increase their involvement (b) the knowledge and experience that these children bring to the classroom are constantly devalued (Macedo, 1994; Pease-Alvarez & Hakuta, 1992) – to call bilingual students *limited English proficient* is a good example of this deficit-oriented practice – and (c) students' stratification is largely determined by their backgrounds rather than by earned skill or expertise. Until these obstacles are removed, language minority students will continue to be certainly peripheral but not legitimate participants in communities of practice.

What we have here is an obliquely structured list of recommendations posing as a list of perceived impediments to good practice. (And, again, the Reader sets up an

echo of a counterclaim i.e. the theoretical picture is one thing, my view is quite another.) The implication is clear: remove these obstacles and you will be closer to realizing correct implementation of LPP. In other words, this Reader is just as much in the business of making recommendations as her colleagues cited above, although her technique for making these recommendations is somewhat less direct.

8.3.2. Step 2 Reaffirming belief

3 texts chose to secure Primary Knower status in the closing move of the text simply by restating definitively and in summative form their preferred knowledge claim in the face of the 'incorrect' knowledge claim of the Author. A case in point was RR1:

Reid sees the threat of abusive appropriation bearing down on our profession from a group of vocal and narrowly focused researchers and misguided teachers. I see the problem lurking in any individual who misapplies the research and disregards classroom experience. I am sure someone will discover that both researchers and teachers have their truer than true myths. Until then, I wish we would bury this futile division between process and product and get on with teaching composition.

The Author, it is implied, has reopened 'this futile division between process and product'; the Reader, worthily, just wants to get on with teaching composition. Who, then, gets the reading public's vote? But once again we encounter the question of overlap. For although the Reader reaffirms his belief as a contrast (but, interestingly, not as a counterclaim) to the Author's position, there is an underlying recommendation for future teacher action – getting on with teaching composition and forgetting the process/product controversy.

Similarly confident in the persuasiveness of her own belief is the writer of

RR9:

In the end, I find Spack's position a particularly ethnocentric one in that it limits L2 educators' world view by valuing the individual more than the group to which the individual belongs. Indeed, many Asian students may themselves construct their identities primarily as members of their particular cultures, and to deny them this identity is to fail to recognize what they may value in themselves. We have an obligation to know them as they know themselves and to use that knowledge to inform our pedagogical practices.

Here, again, we have the Author targeted as someone peddling a limiting, self-centred perspective on the issue, whereas the Reader's is a more open, student-centred one which embraces rather than denies. It is simply not *preferable* to adopt the Reader's perspective here, it is an '*obligation*' to know students as they know themselves, the Reader tells us, confident that her broad, embracing philosophy will carry the day faced with the Author's narrower, more exclusive interpretation of identity and thus confirm the Reader as Primary Knower. But surely there is more here than a reaffirmation of belief? With *We have an obligation to know them... and to use that knowledge to inform our pedagogical practices.*, we are invited to view the Reader not just someone of sound pedagogical belief but almost as a strategic educational thinker who is capable of plotting the way ahead for us all. In other words, we are observing yet again an implied recommendation for the future.

In RR6, unlike the previous two texts, there is no juxtaposing of Reader and Author view, with the dice heavily weighted in favour of the former's beliefs. Here, the Reader sweeps aside all mention of the Author and takes centre-stage with her own summative 'take' on how teacher education should be constructed:

We as language educators stand at a time in educational history when our intellectual traditions are being eroded and even deconstructed. We dignify our predecessors, as well as today's thinkers, when we remind ourselves and our readers of the importance of the persistent

questions that every thinking generation must re-ask and reexamine. As we reconstruct L2 teacher education, we should remember that thinking is the very foundation of intelligent experience.

But as in the earlier two texts, the Reader sounds words that are rallying calls to the enlightened and responsible of the teaching profession: *We.. stand at a time in educational history.....our intellectual traditions are being eroded...We dignify our predecessors.....the very foundation of intelligent experience.* The call to integrity with the use of sonorous rhetorical resonance is almost Churchillian and the Reader seeks to carry the argument and community consensus by her appeal to ideals that few could question. What the Author's views actually *were* are all but forgotten in this fine rhetorical play for Primary Knower status. But yet again, there is surely more implied than a reaffirmation of pedagogical belief. The Reader once more has an eye to the future and she knows how the future should be constructed, or rather, reconstructed: *As we reconstruct L2 teacher education, we should remember that thinking is the very foundation of intelligent experience.* Although largely concerned with articulating her own personal beliefs, she cannot refrain from indicating, albeit in a somewhat vague way, how that belief should help inform the future.

8.3.3. Step 3 Summative counterclaiming

In discussing displacement triads we saw the undoubted popularity of counterclaiming. While most of the Readers chose to make their closing move with some other strategy or combination of strategies, two Readers still favoured this particular action in final position so that they left the reading public with their own perspectives in the ascendant. Here the counterclaims were aimed not so much at

picking off individual debating points but at summing up a central difference of opinion that had triggered the intervention in the first place. As in certain texts discussed earlier in this section, the views of Reader and Author are juxtaposed, with the Reader's in information structure terms given the important 'new' information placing at the end of the information unit:

RR8 I am confused by Spack's assumption that in talking about culture, there is a tendency "inevitably to identify U.S. culture as the norm from which students are deviating" (p.767). Within the field of TESOL, those who study cultural differences.. stress the equality of cultures..... Certainly, an educator could teach about cultural differences in a way that favoured U.S. culture, but such an approach is not consistent with my study or with the principles of intercultural communication... Concerning ethnocentrism, Spack has it backwards. It is by learning about cultural differences that we can reduce the number of misunderstandings between communicators, not by not learning about them.

In RR15 the counterclaim is less ideational and more concerned with issues of fact:

RR15 In sum, the role of identification was something I centrally raised and, contrary to Ibrahim's claims, a central question of my research was "And what roles, if any do[es]...identification have in the process of learning?" (Ibrahim, 1999, p.352). I am therefore very uncomfortable that, in an attempt to carve out a research space for himself, Ibrahim has misrepresented my work. He could have easily shown how his work (e.g. his research methodologies) and the linguistic items he examined) differed from mine without saying I did not do something that in fact was a central part of my research.

In both texts, however, counterclaiming, a central technique in the displacive discourse throughout these, and indeed many other texts, is retained for the final *coup de grace* in the writers' ambitions to gain community ascendancy.

8.3.4. . Postscript to Readers' exit strategy.

Looking back at the Reader's 'codas', and at the tables at the beginning of this section, we draw attention to the two most dominant features: the frequency of non-concessive assertions to be Primary Knowers (Move 1B) and, other steps not

withstanding, the frequency of the steps which make recommendations for future practice either in detail or in outline, discretely or in overlap with other steps.

No fewer than eleven of the fourteen texts which asserted Primary Knower status in the closing move chose to do so non-concessively, leaving us in no doubt as to their unalloyed belief in the rectitude of their own views. Their final exit from the text gives no indication that they have taken onboard any positive input, or, indeed, input of any kind, from the original article.

Even more striking was the preponderance of Reader texts which looked to the future in some way in their closing moments. Six of these chose to exit the text with concrete recommendations for future action; three more, while seemingly selecting some other step for their principal final action, made some allusion at least as to how they saw best practice developing, without actually concretizing their proposals.

This closing move helps illuminate our knowledge both of this text-type and of genre-analysis in general. From the point of view of text-type, we see that seizing the future and asserting Primary Knower status appeared here to be inextricably associated in Readers' minds as they sought to exit the text. From the standpoint of genre-analysis in general, this section provides a useful reminder that the parameters of social action in any one step cannot be too tightly demarcated since, as we have seen, while writers may seemingly foreground one social action, they are not precluded from overlapping one action with another. (Steps whose action is seen as overlapping with steps whose principal emphasis appears to be centred elsewhere are marked in brackets in the table earlier in this section.)

It remains to be seen how the stance of Responding Authors in their closing move will follow, if at all, the behaviour of Reacting Readers here.

8.4. Authors and their exit strategies

A study of the Authors' favoured means of performing their closing moves brings us at times back into familiar waters and at others into quite new ones. Familiar were the minority of texts that chose to quit the discussion with a concessive nod to the intervening Reader (Move 1A) while still reaffirming belief in the writer's own perspectives. Familiar, too, was the prevalence of codas which reaffirmed the writer's belief in his/her status as Primary Knower in the interchange without this time any concessive gesture to reacting Readers (Move 1B).

8.4.1. Move 1A Reaffirming concessively Primary Knower status or Move 1B Reaffirming non-concessively Primary status

	Move 1A	Move 1B
AR1		x
AR2		x
AR3		x
AR4		x
AR5		x
AR6		x
AR9	x	
AR10	x	
AR11		x
AR12		x
AR13		x
AR14		X

Table 16. Responding Author exit move pattern

(Discrepant texts AR7, AR8 and AR15 will be discussed in 8.6.4.)

8.5. Move 1A Reaffirming concessively Primary Knower status

Here we note only 2 texts performing Move 1A. It would appear that, by this late stage in the exchange, tolerance of opposing viewpoints is less and less in evidence and even what is initially presented as a concession is hedged somewhat:

AR9 I agree with Carson that teachers “have an obligation to know [students] as they know themselves and to use that knowledge to inform our pedagogical practices” if by that she means the very point I make when I suggest that L2 educators “find room in our pedagogy and scholarship for students to name themselves and thus define and construct their own identities” (p.773).

We note the concession but we note also that it is a concession granted on the Author’s own terms – *if by that she means the very point I make*. The implication is that if the Reader means something else (which might well be possible) then the concession is annulled.

Much less grudging in making this late concession is AR10:

Kanno argues in her response that the community-of- practice perspective is useful in that it forefronts the learner in educational research and “opens up a venue for addressing the relationship between students’ sociocultural experiences and their language acquisition.” I certainly agree, and I further believe that the perspective makes it possible to understand the sociality of learning in deeper ways than L2 educators have heretofore. However,.....

Both texts choose to follow up this concession with a reaffirmation of belief in their own perspectives, a subsidiary step we shall see more of in examining the non-concessive claims to Primary Knower status.

The majority of Authors’ texts – like those of the Readers – dispense with the need to make concessions as part of their exit strategy. Again, like Readers’ texts, Authors’ texts perform Move 1B in a variety of ways (see table below), only one of which is unfamiliar to us from the body of Readers’ texts.

8.6. Move 1B

Reaffirming non-concessively Primary Knower status

by

Step1 Refining motivating intentions
and/or

Step 2 Reaffirming belief
and/or

Step3 Addressing the way ahead

	Refining motivating intentions	Reaffirming belief	Addressing the way ahead
AR1			x
AR2		x	
AR3	x	x	x
AR4	x		x
AR5		x	x
AR6		x	
AR11			x
AR12	x		x
AR13			x
AR14	x	x	
AR15	x	x	x

Table 17. Responding Author Exit Move 1B

8.6.1. Step 1

Refining motivating intentions

We look first at what is novel here: step 1. This involves Authors looking back at their texts in an attempt to add some transparency to the focus of their initial intentions and mental deliberations. By avoiding yet another generalized trumpeting of the Author's beliefs, it appeals to the reading public to understand more fully the Author's parameters in penning the piece, thus making the Author appear rather more approachable- and at times rather more modest - than in Step 2. Nowhere is this clearer and more succinct than in AR3:

What I have presented is no more than a basic framework – one possible alternative to method. There can be others.

Similarly keen to particularize the exact nature of the article content is AR 4:

I response to Price's critique, I have argued that I am more concerned about investigating the conditions under which language learners speak than with validating the central tenets of poststructuralist theory.

A refining statement of intention is again evident in AR12, where the Author sets out finally, as above, not only her aim but also an aim with which hers might have been confused:

Again, my purpose was not to criticize ETS, the TOEFL, or any specific test, testing agency, or test preparation materials. It was to raise an issue of professional ethics for consideration by the profession.

This same desire to help readers avoid mistaking intentions brings a similarly refining hand to the realization of Step 2a in AR 15:

My critique, or I should say citing, of Goldstein's work was not "to carve out a research space for [myself]" and it should certainly not be read this way. It was meant to address the role(s) of race and gender in my research subjects' identification African Americans, which in turn affected their sense of self-identity – which affected what and how they learned.

AR14 performed a more straightforward version of this step, concentrating quite simply on spelling out for the last time the essence of their achievement and, unlike the 3 previous examples, avoiding mentioning any alternative aim with which theirs might have been confused:

We wrote an article that took a piece of the larger picture and delineated the options that teachers have among many types of assessments available today.

This particularizing of the exact intention of the original article can achieve several objectives: it promotes the Author as someone free of carping negative bias ('my purpose was not to criticize', "my critique was not 'to carve out a research space for myself' and it should certainly not be read that way"); it further promotes the Author as someone with relatively modest (yet achieved) ambitions which may have

been misunderstood or attacked by critics anticipating a grander design (“What I have presented is no more than a basic framework –one possible alternative to method. There can be others.”, “an article that took a piece of the larger picture”; it also suggests the Author as someone preoccupied with real world issues rather than abstract concepts (“the condition under which language learners speak rather than ..the tenets of poststructuralist theory”).

In this step, in which the Authors attempt to refine for the benefit of the reading public exactly what it was they were setting out to do in their text, they promote themselves as ‘hands on’, constructive workers in the field who are content to make limited but positively sound contributions to it. They implicitly reject as misplaced the idea of others attributing ego, animus or grandiose ambition to them or to their work. These, in short, are people in whose hands the reading public can safely place their confidence – and, of course, accord their consensus.

8.6.2. Step 2 Reaffirming belief

By this stage in the study we are familiar – perhaps a little overfamiliar – with participants pinning their professional colours to the mast by reaffirming their pedagogical/linguistic beliefs. What is of interest here is that, of the six Authors who chose to perform this step, four did so in conjunction with another exit step: two with refining their motivating intentions, two with addressing the way ahead. At this point of exit, these four Authors clearly felt the need, quite literally, to redouble their efforts in achieving discoursal ascendancy.

8.6.3. Step 3 Addressing the way ahead

Here we feel we are back in familiar territory, although the name we have given to this step has of necessity changed somewhat from the term we used when discussing Readers and their interest in the future. Here we have Authors who, too, in a subtly different way, look to the future. While not making specific recommendations as such for the future, Authors here accord themselves the privileged status of being the party that calls for further research and sometimes delineates those areas where future research needs to be conducted.

They have encountered opposing views from Readers and have parried them confidently in various ways earlier in the text, but, as an insurance policy around their claim to Primary Knower status, they reserve to themselves the role of gatekeepers to how the topic must develop if it is to be illuminated further. Rather than discuss the specific recommendations of Readers – which they have ignored – they prefer to signal to the reading public that what is required is not a list of concrete recommendations but a programme of conceptual research. And they, the Authors, are the people to flag the research required.

Typical of this step is AR 4:

Whether my theorizing of social identity and investment helps to explain the conditions under which learners speak is subject to further inquiry. Nevertheless, I hope that my research makes a contribution to a highly complex set of questions about the relationship between the language learner and the social world. Further research (see, e.g., McKay & Wong, in press) is necessary to refine extend, or refute the theories presented.

As we go further into this step addressing the way ahead by calling for further research, we note a tendency towards a fairly generalized vagueness about the area to be investigated. Above, we heard a call to look at “the conditions under which learners speak”. Similarly lacking in specific detail is AR3:

Clearly, more exploration is needed. What is crucial that teacher educators establish and maintain a good productive relationship with classroom teachers...In short, we need to restructure teacher education so that teachers gain adequate knowledge, skill, and autonomy to continue to reflect, recreate, and reinvent.

After a lengthy repudiation of the Reacting Readers’ views, AR12 calls for further study but in even vaguer terms than the texts above:

I repeat that I hope TESOL as an organization will target this issue as a significant ethical question for the profession.

In apparent contrast is AR 11 where the Author seems to be pinning down the area for research much more precisely.

The time is up for doing more of the things that have not worked well in the past. It is time to try something new.

There are a few studies that we could look at as we seek to develop something new. One of the most impressive was the work done by Simpkins, Holt, and Simpkins (1975) {sic}. They developed a reading curriculum called *Bridge* which was based on the language and culture of Ebonics with contrasting readings and exercises in standard English. The study was conducted over a 4-month period in four cities...At the end of 4 months, the Bridge group had progressed 6.2 months in their reading level whereas the control group had gained only 1.6 months. These researchers had their hands on something. Teachers of Ebonics-speaking students should be about the business of devising curricula and pedagogical strategies to educate these students.

But despite the welter of detail that surrounds this reading programme, it is no more than an illustrative example. The way ahead is still somewhat vague and revolves around nothing more focused than ‘the business of devising curricula and pedagogical strategies to educate these students’.

Slightly more focused is AR 15 :

This question raises another significant issue in TESOL research paradigms that is waiting to be carved out as a research area: the researcher, her or his (racial) subjectivity, the readings that get produced, and the research categories perceived as important.

One of the more informally written texts – AR1 – is the one that calls most specifically of all for more research in clearly demarcated research spaces. While the lexeme ‘research’ is never mentioned, it is clear that she is calling for exactly that:

Finally, I continue to worry. How can I balance my determination to make my scientific and technical writing class student-responsible in the light of the students’ clear need to depend heavily on me? What is the best way for TESOL to approach accreditation of intensive English language programs? And what about revision – lots has been written about it, but we teachers do not really teach revision strategies in the same quantity and quality as we teach composing strategies....

Whether specific in the research spaces they call to be explored or rather vaguer than we might wish, Responding Authors saw the usefulness of such a move. As well as portraying themselves as professionals qualified to undertake trail-blazing for the teaching community (or at least knowing where the trails should be situated), such a step accorded them another bonus in their search for ascendancy. For, by calling for further research, they are in a sense calling a truce in the contention between Reader and Author. By calling for further research they are obliquely indicating an escape from the impasse of conflicting ideas. The discussion does not end here, is the implied message. We Authors see beyond this collision of ideas. In this we are not only showing intellectual prowess but social diplomacy in ending this interchange on an ongoing dynamic rather than a full stop. Our vagueness is intentional for the more unexceptionable we can make our called-for research space sound, the more likely is our call to be heard.

By such a step Authors further consolidate their claim to ascendancy by promoting themselves not only as pace-makers but as peace-makers into the bargain.

8.6.4. Discrepant texts

We have encountered here three AR texts (7, 8 and 15) which do not apparently conform to the generic pattern we have seen emerging in the closing stages of other intertextual exchanges from Responding Authors. In such encounters Richards (2003:282) cautions us that

..a clear-cut case is superficially very attractive, but if it depends on ignoring or smoothing over tiny pieces of evidence that do not fit, the really interesting connections and insights may have been missed.

Miller and Crabtree (1999:142) phrase their advice even more strongly:

Celebrate anomalies. They are the windows to insight.

Of the three texts in question two terminate in overtly rebuttal mode:

The first of these, AR8, exits the discussion with a previously identified displacement triad:

Identification: Nelson asks, “Is Spack proposing that ESL/EFL teachers and researchers remain ignorant of their students’ cultures?”

Non-concessive negation: The answer is an obvious and emphatic “no.”

REPLACEMENT

Belief/practice particularizing: I am not denying the existence of cultural differences. But I am saying that L2 educators need to be careful about who determines what the difference is , how that differences is determined, and especially how we apply knowledge of that difference.

Belief/practice rebuttal: I therefore cannot accept the generalized cultural profile of Chinese students that Nelson assumes in her own research. I disagree with Nelson that getting to know students on an individual level is “an impossible place to begin.” I think it is a good place to start.

The second, AR15, while appearing mildly less categorical in its rejection and appearing even to accept correction – rare, as we have seen in these exchanges – is still, nevertheless, unreceptive to the Reader’s central arguments:

AR15 On the side of production, however, I stand corrected that having a majority of Puerto Ricans as research subjects would not qualify all of them to be Puerto Rican and that, apparently, the statement that the subjects are from the “New York metropolitan area” would not mean that they were all from New York City. Nonetheless, in conclusion, to claim that identification, as defined above, was a central part of Goldstein’s work is only that – a claim, which is undoubtedly open to contestation and different readings.

For all of its appearing to give ground, this final paragraph of the exchange makes it fairly clear that the Author, for one, would be among those offering ‘contestation and different readings’ to the Reader’s claim.

It would be wrong to suggest that these two discrepant texts offer us any really important new insights, but they do serve to underline what has been becoming steadily clearer in this and the previous two chapters: that the broad thrust of these texts is to displace opposing viewpoints rather than to engage in illuminating discussion.

AR7, who, we remember, was the Author who apologized for ‘genre bending’ at the beginning of his exchange, exits his text in a termination as ostensibly unorthodox as his start:

AR7 Again, I would like to thank Professor Jones for making possible the foregoing dialogue. I have found responding to his critique stimulating and enlightening in that it made me question and rethink my views on what constitutes appropriate instruction for ESL writers.

Thanks have not featured at all in the later sections of these exchanges, although they make regular appearances in Entry Move 1, which acknowledges the contribution positively. The attempt here is clearly to attempt to see beyond the confrontational aspects of the central sections of the text and terminate on a positive note. How convincing this note is, however, has to be seen in the context of previous remarks from this Responding Author such as:

This statement seems to me an attempt to trivialize the points made in at least three of the four sections of my essay; I find such an enterprise troubling and offensive....

I see no evidence presented here to support this assertion.

I find the view expressed in the foregoing sentence elitist, patronizing and unfair to student writers.

This assertion seems extremely unlikely to me and rather condescending towards students.

This strikes me as being rather unlikely.

Beneath the surface show of good exit manners, we are still confronted with a text which, like AR8 and AR15, has at its heart a strong drive towards displacement.

8.6.5. Postscript to Readers' and Authors' exit strategies

Whatever persuasive skills Readers and Authors may have exerted on the TQ reading public, they singularly failed here to persuade each other to take onboard the new information contained in their respective counterarguments.

Move 1A in both sets of texts - which made concessions to the opposition - was performed infrequently - three times in the case of Readers and twice in the case of Authors. Much more prevalent was Move 1B with its privileging of unhedged perorations in which the writer's own perspective was unequivocally preferred to that of the counterclaimant. Indeed, reaffirming unhedged faith in their own beliefs was one of the two most popular areas of common ground between Readers and Authors detectable in this Move 1B. Another was their joint belief that they were both, in slightly different ways, qualified to look to how the future of their topic should develop; the Readers by tending to make concrete recommendations, Authors by

laying down the outlines for necessary research. (The Readers' recommendations, it should be noted, were universally unheeded by Authors.)

So one of our reasons for examining these texts – to determine if there is sufficient typification to warrant defining their actions at various key points as generically recognizable – has been satisfied. In these concluding steps, Readers and Authors alike performed textual manoeuvres that manifested a certain generic commonality of behavioral pattern in their respective exit strategies. Despite certain variations in these two sets of patterns, there was a readily identifiable consistency of communicative purpose in the final lines of both sets of texts – to be seen not only as Primary Knower but as gatekeeper to the future development of the TESOL/Applied Linguistics community. The twin roles seemed here to be paramount in their preoccupation with being awarded the TQ reading public's consensus.

Here the confidence of both parties to be acknowledged as Primary Knower remained unshaken by opposing claims. The inability or unwillingness to absorb new input to revitalize previous positions is perhaps the most striking aspect of these texts – and this is never more apparent than in these concluding steps. One Author (AR15) quoted Bourdieu (1990) when he, too, fell victim to criticism of his work:

Most of the questions and objections which have been put to me reveal a high degree of misapprehension, which can go as far as total incomprehension.

We, like Bourdieu, at the end of this analysis process might say that we, too, have been witnesses to misapprehension, not to say, incomprehension on the part of Readers and Authors alike. But misapprehension and incomprehension suggest an effort, albeit a failed one, to engage with an argument. Here, we cannot be sure that such an effort has been made. In these final steps, as elsewhere in this analysis, we are

far from being able to employ comfortably the term ‘dialogue’ for what is happening; rather we are listening to academics talking *at* rather than *to* each other, entrenching themselves in their own arguments and undermining those of their interlocutor in a way that seeks to earn points from the TQ public rather than to augment and advance shared issue understanding.

8.7. Summary of Readers’ and Author’s exit strategy

Move 1A **Reaffirming concessively**
Primary Knower status
or
Move 1B **Reaffirming non-concessively**
Primary Knower status
by

READERS		AUTHORS	
Move 1A	Move 1B	Move 1A	Move1B
Step1 Reaffirming belief (2 instances)	Step 1 Making recommendations (9)	Step 1 Reaffirming belief (2)	Step 1 Refining motivating intentions (5)
Step 2 Making criticisms (3)	Step 2 Reaffirming belief (3)		Step 2 Reaffirming belief (6)
	Step 3 Summative counterclaiming (5)		Step 3 Addressing the way ahead (8)

Table 18. Summary of exit strategies by Readers and Authors

9. EVALUATING TEXT STATUS

Now that our textual analysis has been completed, we are obliged to stand back from these 30 texts to enquire if, in fact, we have caught members of the applied linguistics discourse community in the process of participating in a community recognized genre. Have we seen sufficient examples of situated linguistic behaviour in this academic setting to apply to them any of the following descriptions of genre, listed by Bhatia (2002:22)? Have we seen *typifications of rhetorical action* (Miller 1984) or *regularities of staged, goal oriented social processing* (Martin, Christies and Rothery (1987) or *consistency of communicative purposes* as discussed by both Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993)?

The answer to all this must be a qualified 'yes'. In both the opening and closing manoeuvres which we have explored we have noted recurring linguistic and social action that confirm Bazerman's observation that :

...over a period of time, individuals perceive homologies in circumstances that encourage them to see these as occasions for similar kinds of utterances. (1994:82)

Our writers *did* at certain points in the texts appear to detect "homologies in circumstances" that in turn led to "similar kinds of utterances" as we have listed and discussed in those chapters of this document dealing with textual analyses and which we shall look at again shortly.

Those analyses of the writers' behavioural patterns when opening and closing these intertextual critical exchanges confirm our thesis that the textual regularities that

characterize genres do, in fact, exist here as, indeed, do the recurring socio-cognitive actions solicited in response to recurrent socially constructed situations.

But now we come to the qualification referred to above. While recurrent and situated language behaviour was a feature of the writers' entry and exit strategies for these texts, there was considerably more flexibility of linguistic and social action in the central sections of these texts, as we have already shown. Confronted with the need to engage in debate, writers opted for enhanced individual agency in conducting that debate. Frequently, as we have noted, they fell back on a displacive schema which we have labeled a 'displacement triad', although how this displacement was effected was subject to various individual choices within this construct. And the displacement triad, as we demonstrated, forms part of the common coin of many oral and written utterances engaged in displacive discourse and is certainly not the private property of this particular discourse community or genre.

9.1 Exploring generic integrity

Initially, this split between features belonging to a community genre and those appertaining to various schemata for displacement seemed an obstacle to conferring genre status on our texts. Generic integrity appeared to be seriously compromised by this hybridization of construction. Bhatia, however, extends the boundaries of generic tolerance when he accepts that, in real world circumstances, generic resources are frequently invaded by features of other texts without robbing them of their claim to genre status: For,

....as I started looking at the real world of discourse [I] discovered that it is a mix of various norms and conventions, some clearly established, whereas others [are] less so and some in the process of development. (personal communication 2004a)

He follows up this discussion of genres in the same e-mail with:

Some are rather pure and identified, but most others are hybrids, which includes all kinds of possibilities such as genre mixing, genre embedding (one within the other) ..leading to a number of other generic formations.

He returns to this idea in Bhatia (2004:113):

It is precisely for this reason that the integrity of any generic form is also viewed as dynamic, flexible and sometimes 'contested' (Candlin and Plum 1999).

We are reminded, too, of Bakhtin's comments (1986:79) on genres being, for all their regularities and typifications,

...much more flexible, plastic, and free
than grammatical and other linguistic patterns.

These observations greatly broaden our conception of what constitutes the limits of generic tolerance. By accepting that genres can be infiltrated by other formations without losing generic integrity, we can continue to view our 30 texts as having a strong claim to genre status. Not only is this possible, but these texts in their hybridization join 'most others' in the generic gallery and are, in Bhatia's view, far from being minority exemplars.

Interestingly, however, what we have here is not so much appropriation or embedding by another genre, but rather an infiltration of cognitive structuring by cognitive processing, a community genre invaded by a community-free schematic pattern.

This discussion leads us, however, to question what we mean exactly by generic integrity. How then do we construct integrity in our revitalized definition of it? Is, indeed, a term such as 'generic integrity' still viable or useful, given what we

now know of how the structure can be subject to embedding and appropriation by external forces? For Bhatia the answer is still ‘yes’.

The most important aspect of genre is that it is recognizable and is sufficiently standardized.....It may be complex in that it may reflect a specific form of mixing and/or embedding of two or more generic forms, or even dynamic, in the sense that it may reflect a gradual development over a period of time..... (2004:115)

While accepting now that generic integrity is not compromised by “mixing and/or embedding”, do we have in our texts enough material that is “recognizable and sufficiently standardized” to warrant the conferral of genre status? An overview reminder of the results of our earlier analysis of entry and exit strategies might here be useful to point to those recurring text-internal elements which point to genre status.

Entry Moves and Steps for Readers and Authors

Move 1 Acknowledging contribution positively

Move 2 Overviewing trigger text content

Step 1	Creating quotation-rich review
	Or
Step 2	Creating abridged paraphrase

Move 3 Priming reply

Step 1A	Signalling generalized dissent (with concession marker)
	Or
Step 1B	Signalling generalized dissent (without concession marker)
	Or
Step 2	Signalling particularized dissent (with concession marker)
	Or
Step 3	Signalling text direction

Move 4 Establishing authority

Step 1	Reviewing literature
	And/or
Step 2	Reporting field experience
	And/or
Step 3	Cultivating reader complicity

Exit strategy for Readers and Authors

Move 1A Reaffirming concessively
 Primary Knower status
 or
 Move 1B Reaffirming non-concessively
 Primary Knower status

by

READERS		AUTHORS	
Move 1A	Move 1B	Move 1A	Move1B
Step1 Reaffirming belief	Step 1 Making recommendations	Step 1 Reaffirming belief	Step 1 Refining motivating intentions
Step 2 Making criticisms	Step 2 Reaffirming belief		Step 2 Reaffirming belief
	Step 3 Summative counterclaiming		Step 3 Addressing the way ahead

Even given the differences in the social role of Readers and that of Authors, we have noted, however, not just a similarity of cognitive structuring and linguistic patterning in the opening and closing moves of the discussion, but also an underlying commonality of communicative purpose throughout that seeks to challenge claims and criticisms in the quest for discursive ascendancy and Primary Knower status for the writer. In short, given the cues offered by language and social action, members of the applied linguistics community would be under no illusions as to the identity of the text-type in question nor could genre analysts deny the validity of its claim to recognizable genre status.

But while we can point to adequate internal evidence of sufficiently standardized linguistic and social behaviour for our texts in their outer movements to justify their claim to text-internal integrity, can we claim on their behalf another kind

of integrity, the kind which is not so much concerned with internal regularities as independent identity status? In other words, while we can now attribute generic status to these texts, is it the status of a discrete genre in its own right or of a sub-genre of the research article?

9.2 Genre or sub-genre?

A recurring question facing me as I set out on the analysis of these 30 texts was the need to ascertain whether they were members of a genre or of a sub-genre of the research article. Did their dependency on the existence of a triggering research article limit their claim to independent status, or did their social action, style, tone and effect differ so radically from that of the research article that their independence was assured? Was one text-type subservient to another or were they independent but related units in what Bazerman (1994:97) calls a *system* of genres?

The discipline of seeking internal evidence for any emerging generic behaviour (independent or subsidiary) delayed confronting this issue until the analysis was complete. Indeed, it seemed only sensible to put off this encounter until I had obtained empirical evidence of what it was that the writers had actually done in their texts. Only with this evidence could I compare the textualisation process and the communicative purpose here apparent with that of the research article. Were these intertextual critical exchanges a mere off-shoot of the research article or did they provide evidence of quite different principled choices in terms of textualisation and communicative purpose?

On completion of the full analysis it was clear that while intertextual critical exchanges are symbiotically embedded in the research article set of genres in that ICEs cannot exist without a parent research article, they set themselves a somewhat different agenda and methodology from the research article in advancing their writers' interests.

What, then, *are* the aims of a research article and how does it go about having its claims supported?

Hunston (1993:115) following Latour & Woolgar (1979) is of the opinion that

The social role of the research article is to participate in the gradual process by which the ideas of one group of researchers becomes accepted as part of the general knowledge-bank of the social group as a whole.

Bhatia (personal communication 2002a) takes a view which sees research articles as rather more self-seeking than Hunston's when he observes that they are:

..in a subtle way, promotional, looking for readers, recognition and possibly rewards in the long run.

Taken together, however, the views of Hunston and Bhatia, whatever their differences, promote a view of research articles that judges them to be non-adversarial in approach, seeking acceptance and 'recognition' as they do. Myers (1989:6) takes this view even further:

Outright criticism in print is so threatening that it is usually avoided, and the rival claims are usually briefly denied or even ignored.

But for a new claim to make a contribution it must go beyond the body of existing consensual knowledge and this may lead to face threatening acts. (Brown and Levinson 1987) These 'acts of claiming and denying', however, as Myers (1989:6) later points out :

..will usually be redressed ...with some sort of device to make them more polite...

In intertextual critical exchanges, however, 'outright criticism' is far from avoided by Readers and Authors alike:

- RR2 We find this not only puzzling but also misleading and untrue.
----- This is patently wrong
RR11 Smitherman apparently did not investigate conditions in Oakland, as demonstrated by her use of a statistical inaccuracy to bolster her promise..
RR14 One problem with the article was the confusion it maintained between testing and assessment.
AR7 I find the view expressed in the foregoing sentence elitist, patronizing, and unfair to student writers.
AR8 Nelson trivializes the issue....
AR14 Anthony Bruton's comments on our article essentially criticizes us for writing the article we wrote rather than the one he wanted written. But more seriously, many of his assertions are simply wrong.

Here, not only do we have 'outright criticism', we have at times the harshest criticism of all to be made against an academic: that his/her views and information are simply wrong. The tone is far from that of people participating

in the gradual process by which the ideas of one group of researchers becomes accepted as part of the general knowledge-bank of the social group as a whole.

It is bluntly polemical, not to say downright rude. A clue as to why there should be this tonal and attitudinal discrepancy between RAs and ICEs is to be detected later in the same Myers article:

The denial of an entrenched claim is likely to threaten, not only the researcher who proposed it, but a broad range of readers who have included the challenged claim as one of the assumptions of their research. (Myers 1989:6)

With this latter citation we begin, perhaps, to understand why we see the divergence of approach to politeness in research articles and in intertextual critical exchanges.

The claims we see targeted in our intertextual critical exchanges tend not to be of the

‘entrenched’ variety nor is ‘a broad range of readers’ likely to be threatened by this targeting. The targeted claims are new and threaten only the proposer of these claims. If we look again at the cited criticisms above we note the specificity of the attacking language and the charges:

We find *this*...misleading and untrue.

This is...wrong.

One problem with the article...

I find *the view expressed in the foregoing sentence*.....elitist..

We find the pinpointing of blame further emphasized by the personalizing use of proper names:

Smitherman apparently did not investigate..

Nelson trivializes the issue...

Anthony Bruton’s comments on our article....many of his comments are simply wrong.

There is no question of ‘a broad range of readers’ and their beliefs being threatened here. The attacks are clearly focused on specific ‘offences’ and ‘offenders’ and thus we note the politeness paradigm of research articles largely ignored. In the analysis section of this thesis we have noted examples of concession markers preceding criticism, but we also witnessed the prevalence of unhedged critical comments, further underlining the more trenchant approach to the disposing of unappealing claims.

Research articles, as one commentator has already suggested, are about seeking ‘readers, recognition and rewards.’ Intertextual critical exchanges, on the other hand, are more concerned, as our analysis has shown, with making critiques, challenges and counter-claims. The one is promotional; the other polemical. Ultimately, of course, research articles and intertextual critical exchanges alike are both concerned with winning consensus and ascendancy from readers and members

of the applied linguistics community, but the former seeks to do so in a way that is broadly collegial, the latter positions itself more aggressively. Clearly the divergences of approach to relational politeness in research articles and in intertextual critical exchanges relates to the differences of route by which each party seeks to arrive at this common goal.

So, while relating to each other, these text-types retain their own personalities yet conform to Bazerman's notion of a system of genres. For Bazerman systems of genre are

...interrelated genres that interact with each other in specific settings. Only a limited range of genres may appropriately follow upon another in particular settings, because the success conditions of the actions of each require various states of affairs to exist. That is, a patent may not be issued unless there is an application. (Bazerman 1997:97-98)

And in our case, an intertextual critical exchange cannot be created unless there is a research article to criticize. Bazerman labels genres occupying the place of ICEs as 'follow-up genres'. (1997:98)

The differences between research articles and ICEs in route-planning are such that while we see the two text-types as being closely related – indeed, ICEs could not exist with RAs – the distinct socio-cognitive and politeness features of ICEs which we have explored earlier in this study set them apart as a separate, or rather a follow-up genre, in Bazerman's phrase.

While it is beyond the scope of this research to determine and list the full extent of their differences, the distinctive use of linguistic resources and those divergences in style, tone and effect we have noted suggest that more research is

required if we are to understand fully the relationship between these two separate but related genres in this research article system of genres.

9.3. The bi-partite factor

In 9.2. we raised the question of the independence of the ICE's genre status before situating it as a 'follow-up' genre in a system of genres, to use the Bazerman terminology. But perhaps there is a further question to be raised about the ICE's genre identity, posed this time by its bi-partite nature. Or, put another way, when can we say we have witnessed a performance of the genre? When the Reader reacts? Or is the genre only complete when *both* parties have engaged in an exchange? (For very obvious reasons, we cannot have an instantiation of a Responding Author text on its own when there is no challenge to answer!)

Any search of the *TESOL Quarterly* archives reveals that there are many Reader Reacts texts, however, which have not elicited an Author Responds follow-up. Or put another way, sometimes there are challenges which are not taken up. Are we seeing then a performance of a genre?

In the above case, it is my contention that we have seen a performance of an intertextual critical challenge which makes up only one part of what we have come by academic custom to see as a kind of critical adjacency pair. Although, as we have seen in our analysis, the drive to obtain and retain ascendancy in the mind of the reading public unites both sets of texts in a common pursuit, a full performance of the genre is only evident when we have witnessed the full range of social and linguistic variations available to them.

Throughout chapters 6, 7, and 8 we have examined the generic choices available to Reader and Author and, while we have noted a fairly broad agreement by both parties that each text should, on either side of a displacive discussion, perform certain generic opening and closing moves and steps, there have been significant role-driven behavioural variations in the nature of these actions.

Without attempting a recapitulation of the findings of chapters 6, 7 and 8, we remember on the linguistic front, for example, how the positive acknowledgement of the 'other's' intervention may vary: in the case of the Reader this welcome is to the article, piece or the questions raised; in the Author's case the welcome is often to the opportunity, the debate or the dialogue which the intervention gives rise to. In terms of social action, whereas Readers may set out to win the good opinion of the public by carefully over-viewing trigger text content and showing easy familiarity with the relevant literature, Authors may perform a parallel action with more attention to cultivating reader complicity. In the central discussion sections, while we recall that Readers and Authors alike favoured the displacement triad, there were significant variations in how, for instance, the negation was handled, with the Authors being far more reticent in overtly gainsaying their Readers and yet, nevertheless, managing to do so effectively. And in the closing stages, we noticed a curiously divergent view on how both parties addressed the future, the Readers favouring recommendations while the Authors saw themselves more as gate-keepers for future research.

Even the brief summary of behavioural divergences referred to above reveals that, although Readers and Authors may be united in the common pursuit of Primary Knower status, there are often contrasting voices at work here, some clearly

belonging to Readers, some to Authors and some common to both, but rising antiphonally from either side of the divide when the exchange gets under way. At times a counterclaim may be met with a counterclaim; at times with a claim of notional misunderstanding. A polite acknowledgement of a contribution's worth may meet with a balancing politeness cadence; at times with an unhedged signal of dissent.

My early hope that Move X in a Reader Reacts text would regularly elicit Move Y in that of a Responding Author proved to be unfounded. As the research progressed – and as I have taken pains to explain – it became evident that the reluctance of both parties to take onboard new information, preferring to entrench themselves in the rightness of their own original positions, made such reciprocal targeting in exchanges an unrealistic hope. Nevertheless, a recurring array of behavioral responses (discussed in 9.1.) that united Reader and Author brought a recognizable unity of a kind to their exchange, even allowing for the role-specific divergences discussed earlier.

As part of the research-process system of genres, the ICE requires to be understood by any student interested in participating fully in the RA process of the TESOL/Applied Linguistics discourse community. It is a bi-partite genre-driven construct whose techniques for negotiating displacement, replacement and ascendancy are often at variance with the techniques of successful research article textualization. Those involved in the research article process, either as Reader or Author, benefit from a knowledge of the situationally-situated choices available to them as evaluators or evaluated. Alone, the Reader's voice sets up a challenge which

may make a fine statement on its own yet seems incomplete until the challenge meets the antiphonal voice of the Author. What music is available to each participant and when it may be sung has formed much of the substance of this study. Knowledge of the full repertory available to Reader and Author is useful for participating successfully in this interplay of voices. It is the interplay of these voices that reveals not only the full extent of the repertory but creates also the tension of the exchange.

10. CHECKING GENERIC FINDINGS

Any study of Reader and Author action in realizing a *TESOL Quarterly* ICE enhances the credibility of its findings by checking them for their transferability against those of any other ICE from the same publication. It seemed a reasonable decision to test the findings against a randomly chosen intertextual critical exchange from the next issue after the initial analysis of the 30 texts had been completed in 2002. The choice fell on an ICE in which Reacting Reader Dwight Atkinson challenged certain aspects of Author Ryuko Kubota's article "Discursive Construction of the Images of U.S. Classrooms" in Volume 36/Number1/Spring 2002. Since both parties were at the time of publication members of *TESOL Quarterly's* Editorial Advisory Board, the exchange can point to a pedigree of some authority. Once this exchange had been identified, it was put aside until after the completion of the analysis above of the core corpus and the formulation of the generic pattern proposed in 9.1..

The ICE itself appears as Appendix B at the end of this document.

My approach will be to examine this ICE against the checklist of typifications of rhetorical action already identified elsewhere in our collection of texts. My aim is to determine to what extent the generic profile identified in my findings is, in principle, transferable.

10.1. Opening Moves in Atkinson/Kubota ICE

Move 1	Acknowledging contribution positively Not performed by Atkinson Performed by Kubota
---------------	--

Of the 4 moves we have earlier identified as belonging to the opening text launching procedure, this was the only one not to be performed by both parties, Atkinson preferring to open with a quotation rich review (see below) which he later paraphrases, somewhat scathingly, and which may, of course, explain his hesitancy in opening with a politeness gesture. Kubota, more traditionally, makes a gesture – albeit a brief, totally routine one - in the direction of politeness:

I welcome Dwight Atkinson's comments.....

The tone given overall in the opening paragraphs by Reader and Author alike is that this exchange represents more of a tense confrontation of opposing standpoints rather than an opportunity for collegial dialogue. Hence we find one participant ignoring the politeness move altogether and the other performing only a brief, token version of it.

Move 2	Overviewing trigger text content Performed by Atkinson Step 1 Creating quotation rich review Performed by Kubota Step 2 Creating abridged paraphrase
---------------	---

Atkinson eschews Move 1 altogether in favour of a rather extended quotation rich overview of what he sees as the key points of the Kubota article with which he wishes to engage:

In “Discursive Construction of the Images of U.S. Classroom” (Vol.35, No. 1, Spring 2001), Ryuko Kubota writes,

The underlying assumption in the discourse of cultural dichotomy is that the U.S. culture is the norm..... Applied linguistics, grounded in liberal cultural relativism, would not accept the normal/abnormal divide on the surface, *but the mission of teaching English inevitably presumes what is standard and what is not Although contemporary [applied linguistics] discourse avoids discussions of inequalities and maintains power relations, racism, another colonial legacy, persists... Hidden in this discourse is the old hierarchy of racial superiority that determines which form of cultural product or practice is the norm or deviant [italics added].* (pp.24-25, 28)

In addition, he adds as an afterthought a brief, subjective abridged paraphrase with which Kubota might not agree:

The only plausible reading I can give these words is that ESL teachers and applied linguists, by their very involvement in the field, are racists.

Kubota’s contribution performs an even more abridged paraphrase and does not include quotations from Atkinson. This overview of the gist of Atkinson’s commentary is reduced to occupying in fact only the second part of the sentence which realizes her Move 1; we have here two moves performed in a single sentence:

I welcome Dwight Atkinson’s comments, as they clarify some of the points he has made in his previous work and caution against essentialism in critical scholarship.

More text-content information, admittedly, however, filtered through Kubota’s value-prism, emerges in the Move 3 Priming Reply.

Move 3	Priming reply
	Performed by Atkinson
Step 3	Signalling text direction
	Performed by Kubota
Step 2	Signalling particularized dissent (with concession marker)
Step 3	Signalling text direction

In priming his reply Atkinson favours step 3 which signals direction, not one of the more common choices in reply priming, and one more often found in Authors' Responses rather than Readers' Reactions. In this step the writer previews the approach and direction his text will be taking:

It is my intention to examine this proposition here, both in general and specifically as it relates to one ESL teacher/applied linguist Kubota uses to exemplify such "racism" – myself.

He later returns to this signalling of textual direction shortly afterwards (amalgamating it with some additional paraphrasing, thus reminding us that steps may be at times 'layered', in that more than one social action can be performed in a single linguistic unit):

To paraphrase, Kubota's quotation, which in fact fairly summarizes her main arguments, English language teaching/applied linguistics is pervaded by an ideology of (U.S.) racial superiority that operates through maintaining standards of normal/abnormal, "us" versus "them". Quite apart from questions regarding the elision of TESOL and applied linguistics, or the special place of the United States in all this, I will here in more detail investigate how Kubota substantiates her points.

In priming her reply Kubota chooses a more familiar step option i.e. step 2 in which she signals her dissent preceded by a concession marker and follows it with some particularization of that dissent. It must be noted, however, that the concession is somewhat devalued by the assignation of the point Atkinson makes to a source more than ten years old, perhaps relegating the information to the category of 'given'.

Her dissent is not performed by any discrete statement of negation but her use of the word “reactionary” equates with our Type 3 negation discussed in Chapter 7.

I agree with Atkinson that Said’s (1978) critique of Orientalism runs the risk of essentializing the all-encompassing Occident as a category opposite to the Orient, as Clifford (1988) has pointed out. Nevertheless, Atkinson’s critique strikes me as reactionary, defending a liberal pluralist stance that takes little account of the power and politics influencing the construction of images of the Self and the Other. Furthermore, its color- and privilege-blind individual approach to racism, in effect, denies the existence of racism and avoids confronting it

As we noted earlier, Kubota makes use of this dissent signalling step to add to her previous terse summary of Atkinson’s text-content, but the additional paraphrased information conveyed is subject to such personal evaluation that one would not wish to assign to it information-neutral status. Having signalled her dissent she, like Atkinson, signals the direction her text will take and proceeds to step 3:

His criticisms have thus compelled me to reiterate the main point of my article and to provide more detailed discussions of racism to expose its complexity in ways that go far beyond mere individual prejudice.

Move 4	Establishing authority
	Performed by Atkinson
Step 1	Reviewing literature
Step 3	Cultivating reader complicity
	Performed by Kubota
Step 1	Reviewing literature
Step 3	Cultivating reader complicity

Although we signal Atkinson as performing steps 1 and 3, we must note that they are performed somewhat unorthodoxly. They are, in places, ‘layered’ or superimposed, one upon the other, as we shall see in closer examination later.

In performing step 1, Atkinson is somewhat restrained in the quantity of his references to authority, (recalling more the behaviour of Responding Authors rather

than that of Reacting Readers.) Furthermore, he interweaves his references throughout the text rather than confining them to any one section of it. Including references to Kubota's 1999 work and his own work (4 independently authored and 2 co-authored), these number 13 texts in total. This policy of dispersal makes the exemplifying of citation-pattern problematic for the analyst, demanding as it does the extrapolation of the citations from the argument flow. Nevertheless, the following is an attempt to demonstrate usage:

The main theoretical concept Kubota uses to support her arguments is *orientalism* (see also Kubota 1999, where the notion is given further theoretical development). A major assumption of orientalism (Said, 1978, chap.1) is that.....Without a doubt, such orientalizing discourses do clearly exist in "the West" (as well as in other parts of the world; Kubota, 1999), and scholars such as Said (e.g.,1978) have done exemplary work in exposing them.....Orientalist theory claims that, while all non-Western others are of course individuals, an "Westerner" who teaches or writes or talks about them is participating in the all-pervasive discourse of orientalism, or othering (e.g. Said, 1978, p.2).....It is also dehumanizing in that it puts a large number of people (not just applied linguists, in fact, but anyone who happens to believe that people do, among other things, "live culturally" – Ingold, 1994, p.330)..... My own work (Atkinson, 1997; Atkinson and Ramanathan, 1995; Ramanathan and Atkinson, 1999), for instance is prominently featured in Kubota's attempts to establish the pervasiveness of orientalist discourse..

It must be said that this literature review cannot be described as entirely typical of those we have encountered elsewhere in the study. Apart from its tendency to straggle through the text rather than to appear primarily in block format, the literature referred to is at times *itself* central to some of the issues under discussion (i.e. is Atkinson's work orientalist or not? See last sentence of the above citation.) rather than simply supportive of argument in general, as is the case in more traditional literature reviews. Nevertheless, the literature references in these opening paragraphs before Atkinson begins his discussion of the three points at issue are central to priming the reading public on the forthcoming debate and may be seen as a form of

literature review, albeit, strictly speaking, not of the kind we are accustomed to see elsewhere in the corpus texts.

As we noted earlier in this section, Atkinson overlays his literature review with another step, that of cultivating reader complicity (step 3). Before turning to the three points he wishes to make here, Atkinson performs a brief version of step 3 i.e. he attempts to cultivate reader complicity by helpfully unpacking for them the theoretical concept behind this exchange – orientalism. He has already paraphrased Kubota's arguments in his move 2 and now he moves on to explain the theoretical concept which drives these arguments, weaving part of the unpacking through parts of his literature review already cited:

The main theoretical concept Kubota uses to support her arguments is *orientalism* (see also Kubota, 1999, where the notion is given further theoretical development). A major assumption of orientalism (Said, 1978, chap.1) is that all "Western" characterizations of "non-Western" others – and, as stated in her quotation, Kubota clearly sees this assumption as applying without exception to ESL teaching as well – are based in well-worn discourses that see "non-Westerners" and their cultures as static, tradition-bound, irrational, passive, imitative, primitive, rigid, and so on – in a word, inferior.

As well as being explanatory, however, Atkinson's 'explaining' is also clearly negatively evaluative of the 'major assumption' of orientalism cited. We may well imagine the dismay engendered amongst the majority of Western ESL practitioners by being accused of viewing their 'non-Western' students as 'tradition-bound, irrational, passive, etc' and 'inferior' – which is how Atkinson claims orientalism positions them. Clearly, like the writers of AR4 and RR6 discussed in 6.5.3., Atkinson's explanatory 'help' is evaluatively slanted under the guise of being an expository 'clarification'. In performing this step in such a way, Atkinson appears to

be conditioning readers for their agreement with the upcoming displacement triad discussed in the next section.

It would be injudicious to overemphasize the strength of this covert conditioning of the reading public to support Atkinson's later case. Nevertheless, it presents him relatively early in the text as an obliging interpreter of concepts and clarifier of terms.

Again, we find the Reacting Reader Atkinson favouring action (step 3) - the cultivation of reader complicity - more akin to the pattern adopted by Responding Authors than that by Reacting Readers. (This was a step performed 5 times by Responding Authors and only once by a Reacting Reader. See 6.5.3.)

Unlike Atkinson's, Kubota's approach to reviewing the literature is entirely more familiar, although we are made to wait a little for it. Despite the fact that she mentions Said and Clifford early in the text she does not begin fully realizing step 1 i.e. reviewing the literature, until she has performed step 3 which aims to cultivate reader complicity.

This was a step we discussed at some length in Chapter 6 where we noted that it was a step performed almost exclusively by Responding Authors. There we discovered that there were various ways employed by Authors to draw the reading public closer to them. As well as presenting themselves as being generally helpful to promoting reader understanding, one of the more popular ways adopted by Authors was to take the reader into the Author's confidence regarding what his/her legitimate and well-defined ambitions for his/her text were and what they were not. In addition,

this approach often indicates that the Author is well aware that these legitimate goals might well be either misrepresented or misunderstood by critics (such as Atkinson), and articulating this early on helps cut the ground from beneath objections whenever they might arise. This she does as follows:

My article aimed to show how images of U.S. classrooms, or the Self, are portrayed differently in the literature of applied linguistics, education, and teaching English/literacy as well as to reveal how the construction of these idealized images of U.S. classrooms vis-à-vis Asian classrooms reflects the discourse of colonialism that have created and maintained unequal relations of power between the Self and the Other. As such, it was not my intention to “construct applied linguistics views of culture as simplex, closed, dichotomous, and determinate.” I was actually well aware of the potential problem of essentializing the fields under review, as I expressed in my article (p.11).

Like AR4 and AR12 (as discussed in 6.5.3.) she rejects any suggestion of negative intentions:

As such, it was not my intention to “construct applied linguistics views of culture as simplex, closed, dichotomous, and determinate.”

Only after the reader has been ‘brought aboard’ does Kubota launch into step 1, her literature review. Unlike Atkinson, she tends not to weave her authorities into her own text so much as list them as back-up to the points she is making, e.g.:

The social and political construction of knowledge and its implications for L2 teaching and learning have been widely discussed in the field (e.g. Canagarajah, 1999; McKay & Wong, 1996; Pennycook, 1989; 1998; Phillipson, 1992). Furthermore, many researchers have critiqued the way ESL students and their cultures are portrayed in some publications, including the one authored by Atkinson (e.g. Benesh, 1999; Spack, 1997; Stapleton, 2001; Susser, 1998; Zamel, 1997)

Nevertheless, in the course of her text, Kubota makes appeal to no less than 31 authorities, more than six times the norm noted for Responding Authors in 7.12. This is the second highest frequency noted in the study and underlines the determination of the Author to use her familiarity with the literature as a key factor in her drive for Primary Knower status.

This is one aspect of this exchange which does not match with our earlier findings with regard to the use made of authority by Readers and Authors. We recall that authority citations appeared more frequently in RR texts than in those of Responding Authors; allowing for the exclusion of one atypical AR text, the average for RR texts was 9 and that for AR texts 5. Atkinson, here the RR, had recourse to 13 authorities (6 of which he has authored or co-authored himself) and Kubota 31. Looking more closely at Atkinson's challenges, however, we begin to see why he has felt comparatively little need for the support of authority. (Indeed, allowing for the fact that he has been obliged to mention 6 of his own works as part of his attack, the number of authorities in his list numbers only 7.) His complaint concerns not 'the worth of Kubota's arguments' ('some of the ideas she promotes have worth', he says), but 'her highly questionable ways of constructing them'. His quarrel, he claims, is with how she misrepresents his work to make her own points. His is a challenge centred on the textualization process and her manner of arguing rather than on any insurmountable impasse or irreconcilable conflict of ideas. This is a point that does not cry out for the backing of authorities to carry the day, more a clear presentation of why the writer feels misrepresented.

Kubota ignores Atkinson's complaint of misrepresentation entirely and cites 31 named authorities to bolster the 'rightness' of her original position, refusing to confront the objections raised, preferring to, as she says herself, 'reiterate the main point of my article'. This refusal to take on board objections raised and new input, insisting rather on the rightness of one's own position has already been encountered and discussed in Chapter 7. So, while we see a ratio of references far from typical, the

end to which this ratio is put here by Kubota is disappointingly familiar. It forms part of her platform to insist on her Primary Knower status.

Despite the certain localized variations detailed above, we see that, between them, Atkinson and Kubota made confident use of the generic patterning in the selection of moves and steps previously detected in Readers' and Authors' entry moves (discussed in Chapter 6). Atkinson performed 3 of the 4 moves (albeit at times idiosyncratically) and Kubota all 4. Step selection behaviour, too, presented no real surprises, with all those performed consistent with the selection list noted in the core corpus.

10.2. Core section behaviour in Atkinson/Kubota ICE

In Chapter 7, dealing with writers' behaviour in the central sections of the ICE, the dominance of displacive discourse was examined at some length, as was one of its principal tools – the displacement triad. Turning to the Atkinson/Kubota ICE, our first concern is to establish whether such an approach and such techniques figured as prominently in the central sections of this ICE.

Even a cursory examination confirms that the same preoccupation and techniques are to be detected.

In more detail, even before Atkinson has arrived at the first of the three points he wishes to make with regard to Kubota's comments, he performs his first displacement triad:

Identification: It is largely on the basis of such a conception [orientalism] that Kubota applies terms like *essentialism*, *othering*, *stereotyping*, and *dichotomization* to culturally oriented studies in applied linguistics and TESOL.

Concessive negation: Without a doubt, such orientalizing discourses do clearly exist in “the West” (as well as in other parts of the world; Kubota, 1999), and scholars such as Said (e.g., 1978) have done exemplary work exposing them. But I find the tenet that they are all-encompassing and without exception a curious one at best.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: This is because orientalism falls of its own weight when subjected to its own critique – it becomes *itself* essentializing, dehumanizing, dichotomizing, stereotyping, reductive, and self-contradictory rhetoric.

Counterclaim support: Orientalist theory claims that, while all non-Western others are of course individuals, any “Westerner” who teaches or writes or talks about them is participating in the all-pervasive discourse of orientalism, or othering (e.g. Said 1978, p.2). The very theory of orientalism itself, therefore, appears to be an essentializing, othering, and totalizing one, in that it reduces all Westerners (or anyone engaged in anything that is, according to the judgment of Kubota and others, an orientalizing discourse) to “social dopes” under the iron-clad control of this discourse. So where it is wrong, immoral, and racist to “other” or essentialize non-Westerners, labeling, stereotyping, and reductionism flow freely and naturally in the opposite direction. Although this may be a viable form of political-moral retribution against the West for past and present sins of colonial and neocolonial aggression, it does not seem to work as an academic argument.

He then turns to “the three ways in which Kubota misrepresents” the research which he (Atkinson) has conducted into critical thinking and the ideology of individualism. Clearly, as a self-respecting academic, Atkinson cannot let a misrepresentation of his work stand and we are cued-in for some upcoming discourse which will be aimed at displacing these misrepresentations. We are immediately confronted with a displacement triad of the kind which Chapter 7 has familiarized us with:

Identification: On p. 12 of her article, Kubota cites my coauthor and me (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999) as “perceiv[ing] the main goal of education in the United States as the promotion of logical, analytical, and critical thinking skills, reflecting and promoting individualism as a cultural value.”

Non-concessive negation: I am sorry to say I have no idea what “the main goal” of U.S. education is, and I challenge Kubota to find it stated in my work.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: But I am reasonably sure that one of its important *consequences* is to reproduce the current social structure.

Counterclaim support: This has been a major focus of mine in writing about critical thinking and other social practices apparently based on an ideology of individualism; that is, although such social practices are in fact usually a part of the noneducational, early-acquired *cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1982; see also Gee, 1996; Heath, 1983, 1991) of particular groups, they masquerade as educational accomplishments, and therefore justify and reinforce

the continued dominance of insiders over outsiders, haves over have-nots (Atkinson, 1997). Kubota therefore grossly misportrays our article, where we were basically critiquing an ideology of individualism apparently underlying certain concepts and practices of teaching writing in the U.S. university and, in this important sense, U.S. education itself.

This first misrepresentation cleared up, Atkinson turns to a second where he fields a displacement triad beginning with a Type 3 negation, or put another way, a triad with an Identification relying on lexical anticipation to perform the act of negation. The lexical anticipation here is triggered by the word “misrepresents” whose unpacking will de facto lead, if not to a discrete act of negation, certainly an implied one :

Type 3 negation: In similar vein, Kubota misrepresents my work on critical thinking (Atkinson, 1997), individualism (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999) and university L1 versus ESL writing programs (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995) when she writes, “The above conceptualization of U.S. education portrays an image of a teacher who uses a dialogic teaching approach that encourages the exchange of logical arguments rather than a didactic approach that transmits knowledge” (p.13)

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: Kubota apparently cites us here on the basis of our use of empirical data to exemplify, in the university L1 versus ESL writing program study, the former’s efforts to teach critical thinking.

RR reaction rejection: In fact, we had nothing at all to say about “dialogic” teaching via the “exchange of logical arguments” versus education-by-transmission: nor did we attempt to extend our findings to U.S. education as a whole. We have stated elsewhere our belief that a certain (more or less idealizing) disposition towards argumentation characterizes some segments of U.S. society, as part of a larger ideology of individualism that all peoples of the world – including very broadly speaking (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999, note 5), some non-European American social groups – may not necessarily share. But this is a far cry from Kubota’s misleading claim.

From an analysis point of view, this is perhaps the most interesting of the three points raised by Atkinson. Or rather, his *handling* of it makes it interesting. Atkinson is replying ostensibly in the role of the Reacting Reader, but his reaction is conditioned by what he saw as misrepresentation of his work as an *author* in Kubota’s trigger text. The second line of his Replacement dyad is one of a category detected only once in our corpus - and that in the second line of the dyad of a

Responding Author when s/he rejects the ‘reaction’ of a Reacting Reader. Hence what might appear an odd glossing of the line as ‘RR reaction rejection’. (Reacting Reader’s reaction rejection). Looking at the action more closely, we see that Atkinson is here caught between roles, as it were, and ‘responds’ rather in the persona of a Responding Author than ‘reacts’ as a Reacting Reader – and turns the tables on Kubota. As a result, we see a Reacting Reader behaving in the second line of his Replacement dyad in a way recorded previously in the behaviour of a Responding Author.

When Atkinson turns to the third of Kubota’s “misrepresentations”, he again uses the Type 3 negation form of the displacement triad, employing now the word “discussion” whose unpacking will effectively negate Kubota’s claim:

Type 3 negation: On p. 29 Kubota takes my coauthor and me to task for “an applied linguistics *discussion* [italics added] which presents “idealized images of U.S. classrooms that reflect U.S. middle-class norms and values.... as a ‘necessary convenience.’”

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: The reference here is in fact to Footnote 12 by Atkinson and Ramanathan (1995) – a point not mentioned by Kubota, no doubt because footnotes are harder to reinvent as major, monolithic (essentializing, othering, racist, and so on) discussions. In fact, the footnote referred to our use of the term “American culture” in reporting that, in comparing the U.S. university ESL program and the L1-dominant composition program in the previously mentioned study, the former assumed of its entering students no special competence in American culture, whereas the latter appeared to.

Like Atkinson, Kubota, her entry move 4 performed, loses no time in turning to a by now generically familiar displacement triad which sets the agenda for the rest of her ICE. Or does she? Much of her approach to the triad is familiar:

Identification: I recognize that poststructuralist discourse analysis can be unfair to authors because it focuses more on statements as related to other statements or to subject positions within discourse than on an author’s intentions or concerns (Clifford, 1988). Thus, again, I welcome Atkinson’s clarification of his arguments.

Concessive negation: Nevertheless, I find problematic the implication that there is no regularity in cultural images portrayed by the literature. It is certainly important to avoid reductionism,

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: but merely emphasizing plural views on cultural differences loses sight of the politics and power circulated by discourses that construct knowledge and practice. This focus on the larger political struggle and discourse constitutes a site in which racism needs to be critically examined.

But the critical final part of the Replacement is missing, or appears to be. In the first line of the Replacement dyad she is making one of the key statements which will inform the rest of her text – that emphasizing plural views loses sight of the knowledge- and practice-constructing force of politics and power - and, as such, it cries out for argumentative support. A weakness in textualization? Not at all. When we turn the page we are confronted with the sectional heading:

LIBERAL UNDERSTANDING OF RACISM ONLY AS INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIORS

And the opening words:

Discussing racism is often uncomfortable, particularly in TESOL and applied linguistics.

It immediately becomes clear that our “missing” Replacement section is to be treated as an entire sub-section of the text. Having warned us that “racism needs to be critically examined” Kubota now sets about doing just that. In Chapter 7 we discussed how Replacement sections could fall neatly into single paragraph units or could account for swathes of text much longer than can be practically cited in a document of this kind. Here we have an example of a Replacement dominating the textualization process until the next Identification turn which is also headed by a titled sub-section:

RACISM FACED BY ASIANS AND ASIAN AMERICANS

Here again we have a displacement triad with an extended Replacement turn:

Identification: In response to the above discussion, some may argue that Asian Americans and Asians are considered to be successful “model minorities” and thus that racial discrimination does not affect them in Western society.

Non-concessive negation: However, the academic success of Asian students does not necessarily translate into social, cultural, and political power in the dominant White society; and moreover, Asians and Asian Americans continue to face racism. (Osajima, 1993; Takaki, 1998)

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Osajima (1993), in investigating how Asian Americans cope with issues of race and racism, documented these students’ anxiety and psychological injuries stemming from being positioned as nerdy or “too Asian.”

Counterclaim support: Osajima argues that the discriminations and injuries faced by these students remain hidden because they try to either walk away from them without confrontation or blend into the mainstream by negating differences in order to survive. He states,

These strategies for survival force us to rethink the stereotypical image of the Asian students as quiet and hard working. Their quietness cannot be understood as simply a product of shyness or Asian culture. For the Asian students in this study, silence became a survival mechanism formed in the context of a racially discriminatory society. (p.89)

The exigencies of space demand that we leave this Replacement support turn here but Kubota extends it until her next section sub-heading, thus usefully reminding us that the Replacement turn in the ICE can be as variable in length as it is in social action.

Here in the central sections of the texts we see, again, textualisation processes at work which we have already noted previously in the core corpus, with the main focus being on displacement triads of the kind with which we are now familiar. Again, too, we see the one main variation appearing in Atkinson’s work. Although technically a Reacting Reader in *TESOL Quarterly* terms, he clearly feels there is an element of Responding Author in his position as he replies to what he feels are attacks on his work, not in *TESOL Quarterly* but elsewhere. We return to the ambiguity of Atkinson’s role in 10.4.

10.3. Closing the discussion

In this final section we see Atkinson diverging to some extent from previously documented generic behaviour, Kubota less so.

We noted in Chapter 8 that there was a strong emphasis by Reader and Author alike in making a final push to present themselves as Primary Knower in their closing move. Atkinson in his final paragraph at no time puts himself forward as a Primary Knower, more as an aggrieved Reader. Kubota arrogates to herself the role of Primary Knower in a way that conforms to generic patterns we have already seen well established.

As a Reacting Reader, Atkinson neither asserts concessively nor non-concessively Primary Knower status. He does, however, have recourse to what we have called step 1 of our Reacting Reader's closing move 1B: he makes recommendations:

I therefore challenge Kubota to present her arguments ethically – to “practice what she preaches” – in future research. Equally, I would urge much greater caution in branding whole fields (TESOL and applied linguistics, in this case) as racist, for by doing so one reproduces the very evils one is seeking to defeat.

(In the second sentence there is also an example of step overlap in that Atkinson's action in making recommendations also encompasses an element of criticism ('for by doing so one reproduces the very evils one is seeking to defeat') which was also noted as an option for Reacting Readers.)

Here we must sound a note of caution, however, for in our study the recommendations we found Readers making were on how discourse community

practice and understanding could be improved by adopting the Reader's perspective, usually in preference to that of the Author. Here, however, the focus is a personal one, directed by Atkinson at what he finds to be the dubious argument and textualization practices of Kubota. Nevertheless, we have here yet another instance of a Reader finding that an appropriate choice of step to exit an RR text is one sanctioned by a number of other Readers, albeit here with a slightly different emphasis and slant. Atkinson's closing manoeuvres may not belong strictly to the genre-driven pattern that we have identified earlier in this study, yet he appears to have internalized whether consciously or unconsciously certain text-structuring aspects of it.

Kubota's closing move is more straightforward. Given the self-confident tone throughout the text, it comes as no surprise that after reaffirming non-concessively her Primary Knower status (Move 1B) she performs step 3 i.e. she addresses the way ahead - with resonant finality.

Move 1B

In Atkinson's comments, racism seems to be obscured in the argument that one needs to respect diverse opinions without totalizing them, but this argument fails to recognize that individuals are differently positioned and privileged in society by the effects of race, gender, class, and other traits.

Step 3

Applied linguistics scholarship needs to go beyond this individual pluralist perspective and examine critically how racism sustains itself in various constructs such as cultural dichotomies, Othering, and invisible superiority of the dominant race and civilization. We as applied linguists need to recognize that racism is woven into the very fabric of our institutions, the threads that we must work to make visible and unravel.

10.4. Postscript on the Atkinson/Kubota ICE

Looking back at the full Atkinson/Kubota ICE, we ask ourselves to what extent the generic pattern we have seen at work in our earlier study of intertextual critical exchanges is reflected in the behaviour of this particular Reader and Author.

Kubota is undoubtedly the participant who more closely conforms to the pattern we have seen emerging. She performs all four of the opening moves we have seen as being typical of the text-launching practices of Authors; her central section well illustrates the usefulness of the displacement triad, making full and extended use of the Replacement turn to construct much of her text. Furthermore, her closing move and step echo unremarkably the generic behaviour of many of her Author colleagues. Her main departure from behaviour seen elsewhere by Authors concerns the extent of her recourse to authority in her references section. Where the average number elsewhere was 5 references, Kubota lists 31.

Atkinson's behaviour as a Reacting Reader is not entirely typical, but then again, neither, arguably, is his status. Technically speaking, as we have said, he is a Reacting Reader. Affectively, however, given what he feels are attacks by Kubota on his work elsewhere, he at times veers towards the persona of a Responding Author. This in turn affects the textualization process he adopts in places.

While his overall performance equates broadly with that of Reacting Readers as outlined above, there are a few points at which he adopts behaviour more typical of the Responding Author. We note the untypically low (for a Reacting Reader) frequency of authority references – 6, when we deduct his own works at the centre of

the debate here, and an earlier work of his adversary on which he draws to make his case for misrepresentation. Untypical, too, for a Reader was his blunt rejection of Kubota's 'take' on his view of 'the university L1 program versus ESL program study', a rejection of this kind only previously being found in final position of a Replacement dyad by a Responding Author. In performing step 3 of move 4 – cultivating reader complicity – he joined 5 Authors and only one Reader in so doing.

Atkinson, while occasionally opting out of some practices we have come to see as typical of Reacting Readers, usually does so only to adopt the behaviour of the other participating party in this genre – the Responding Author. He remains a participant with an underlying awareness of many of the text-constructing techniques available to both parties. Only twice do we find him failing to follow the generic pattern norms discerned here for Readers and Authors alike: he fails to acknowledge Kubota's contribution positively (but given his sense of grievance, this is perhaps hardly surprising) and unlike many Readers and Authors, he fails to reaffirm, concessively or non-concessively, his Primary Knower status in the closing paragraphs. Yet he still sees fit - like 9 other Reacting Readers – to make recommendations in the text's closing stages about future action.

All in all, in looking at this ICE in the context of the 15 others we have examined, we begin to see the force of Bazerman's (1994, p.79) statement:

.....the genres in which we participate are the levers which we must recognize, use and construct close to type (but with focused variation) in order to create consequential social action. This machine, however, does not drive us and turn us into cogs. The machine itself only stays working in-so-far as we participate in it and make our lives through its genres....

Atkinson and Kubota, like their colleagues studied elsewhere in this examination, clearly recognized, whether consciously or intuitively, both the existence and the usefulness of Bazerman's 'levers' at their disposal to realize the social action (largely displative in this case) which they had set themselves to perform. Against and within the generic framework of the ICE, Readers and Authors alike set about creating social action of their own, making full use of the 'focused variation' which, as this genre study has shown, can be managed adeptly by our far from cog-like participants.

11. CONSULTING THE WRITERS

Rather than leave the exploration of these 30 Forum contributions as a wholly textual interpretation, I was keen to enrich the analysis by incorporating the views of the participants themselves on the discourse process which they had undertaken. Given that the earliest texts under analysis date from no earlier than 1995 and the latest from as recently as 2000, it was a safe assumption to make that a good number of the Readers and Authors whose contributions we have been studying would still be operational in the field. The 30 texts we examined were the work of 32 writers in total. With the help of the TESOL conference directory and Marilyn Kupetz of TESOL Inc. I was able to trace 22 of them, the others appearing to have retired, left the profession or become otherwise unavailable.

I contacted all 22 and invited them to comment on their texts. I had a number of interests that I wished to satisfy. These concerned:

- the extent of Readers' and Authors' genre awareness
- their motivation in writing
- their feelings in intervening

Anxious that replies be as honest and open as possible, I promised all participants anonymity. Whether due to this promise or not, of the 15 who replied, many gave vent to a sometimes startling strength of feeling. 3 of the 15 only replied formally after a second exchange of e-mails querying my commitment to their anonymity. Of the 15, 7 were Readers and 8 were Authors. The document which I sent to the 22 writers appears as Appendix C.

To respect this anonymity I shall refer to all correspondents in the singular, even when the text was co-authored; all Reacting Readers will be referred to as he/him; all Responding Authors will be she/her. Any alterations to the original texts arise solely out of the desire to respect this convention.

11.1. Genre awareness

I was keen to find out if, when writing their Forum piece, Readers and Authors felt themselves to be constructing their text within some generic tradition or whether they were writing to some individual pattern of their own.

Only one response was unequivocally certain of the genre-driven nature of their contribution:

My response was, of course, intentionally in keeping with the demands of the genre. As indeed it was, when analyzed according to the generic opening and closing manoeuvres identified earlier in this study. Another participant confirmed that in his opinion there *was* a genre for replying to such interventions but that it was not suitable for his particular exchange and begged leave in his published text (confirmed in his response to me) to depart from it:

I seems to me that what I see as the typical response genre – something in essay form that acknowledges the critique and rebuts its major claims – would not work for me in this case.

(And, indeed, he reproduced every ‘offending’ line of the Reader’s text and responded to it intralinearly, ‘error’ by ‘error’.)

There was one other confirmation of a feeling that a generic model existed for such exchanges but that here it did not suit, not so much the participant’s needs, as his personality:

I tend not to be too mindful of the typical genre requirements as I feel that academe can be rather stuffy and complacent even when it comes to exchanges.

As for the others who engaged with this question, there was a much greater reluctance to acknowledge that they were working along genre-driven lines:

- It arose completely naturally from my personal reaction.
- My response was completely motivated by reading the trigger text
- I didn't just dash off a response, but I didn't spend a great deal of time 'crafting' the response to fulfill some ideal of 'responding'.

These were perhaps the most interesting of all the responses since they sent me back to the texts produced by these seemingly individualized reactions and responses to determine if, in fact, they were as personal as they were claimed to be.

The writer of the second comment above was strongly idiosyncratic throughout his text and, although referred to occasionally in my earlier analysis of opening and closing moves, did not conform closely in his writing to any genre-driven model. The writer of the final comment above, however, performed two of the opening moves and the others three, suggesting some proof at least of Bazerman's (1994:82) comment that over time genres 'sediment' into forms so expected and familiar that we barely notice we are working with them. This is clearly the case here where a number of writers had so well internalized the generic format that they failed to distinguish between certain aspects of its structure and their own 'individual' reactions and responses. Nowhere was this marriage of 'individuality' and 'sedimentation' more evident than in the following:

Much, if not most of what I said, arose from my personal reaction/response to the text. I think of the response as a kind of 'letter to the editor' laying out point by point issues that have been misinterpreted or misrepresented in the initial article. I began with the usual global acknowledgment of what I agreed with in the article, addressed each point individually, and then concluded with what I considered to be a more valid (i.e. more than)'s perspective on the issue.

Here he claims that ‘much, if not most of what I said, arose from my personal reaction/response to the text’. Yet he immediately goes on to characterize that ‘personal reaction/response’ in terms of a generic description of the kind we have seen emerging in my analysis.

In certain participants’ minds at least, there *was* some shadowy model of a genre that they thought they were or were not following. What the ‘typical genre requirements’ referred to by one of the above writers actually amounted to was left somewhat vague even by writers attempting one of the above ‘definitions’. But, yes, they felt a genre for approaching this kind of social action *did* exist. Other participants felt their reactions/responses were governed by a spontaneously individual engagement with the trigger text. But, as we have attempted to show (within the limitations of respecting anonymity), these feelings were not always confirmed by the textualization actions which followed in their Forum contributions.

11.2. Setting the record straight

While more informed now on the extent of Readers’ and Authors’ awareness of genre in shaping their texts, I still needed to penetrate the motivational impulses that governed these texts. What goals lay behind their interventions?

Given that Authors and Readers are engaged, as I have already remarked, in different social roles in these texts – the evaluator and the evaluated – I had expected this to colour their behaviour. Admittedly, the sample here was relatively small, but no marked divergence of behaviour between Reader and Author could be detected. Authors did not discuss, as I had anticipated, a need to defend their position. One did,

however, use the intervention to clarify her original position with the aim of aiding other ESL teachers facing her own dilemma:

.....it gave me another opportunity to expand on my ideas and to clarify points that might have also confused other readers of the original article.... I wanted to help other ESL writing teachers who like me, struggled as we made our way through the diffuse and opaque – perhaps even distorted – meanings of {topic deleted} that had appeared in ESL literature.

Two Readers said they intervened because they felt the Authors' original positions needed extending:

- I felt very strongly about the issue that ESOL teachers should grasp not only the principles (macro/micro strategies) of teaching but also the basic teaching techniques.
- I felt like the authors' position did not go far enough.

With these exceptions, Readers and Authors concentrated on setting the record straight. (Below, we find this very expression used twice, with one writer frankly admitting to feeling 'good' about this.)

We have already seen in our discussion of displacement triads how such a self-assumed mission affected their text construction itself, but the comments below help us get under the skin of their intervention by helping us approach more closely their mind sets as they set about writing. If we had any lingering doubts about them viewing themselves as Primary Knowers, these were here finally dispelled by the frank vigour with which they, in these 'off the record' comments, pointed out the 'failings' of their hapless interlocutors. The terms used here were far less circumspect than those which they used in their Forum texts when talking of ignorance, misunderstandings, misrepresentations and distortions

- My intention was to show that there was some very muddled thinking there..
- I was annoyed that she was writing about something outside of her discipline that I thought she was fairly ignorant of.
- It was clear in my mind after reading this article that had not read the L1 research on I won't go through and cite her oversights but they are numerous’s arguments are riddled with distorted claims.
- My purpose was to try to convince TQ readers that’s critique was, at least in my view, almost totally invalid; that is, to try to set the record straight.
- In addition to these disappointments, there were additional flaws that you would not expect from people who are supposedly eminent and run an MA in the subject...
- So I felt good the ‘record’ was set straight.

Terms such as *very muddled thinking*, *fairly ignorant*, *riddled with distorted claims*, *almost totally invalid*, *supposedly eminent*, while refreshingly candid, convey a distinct academic disdain and leave us in no doubt as to how the writers view themselves in relation to those under discussion.

Even the more circumspectly worded contributions underlined the self-confidence of the evaluator to dispose of lesser scholarship and claim Primary

Knower status:

- ... I responded as thoughtfully as I could to the issues he raised. As you note from my responses, however, I did not think that his critique was sufficiently grounded.
- I was responding in order to counter what we perceived as a slightly narrow view about {topic deleted} as expressed by the commentator on my co-author’s and my initial article. I wanted to ensure that the proper picture was given of the purpose, nature, and possibilities of different forms of strategy assessments.
- In addition, her suggestions for {topic deleted} were so vague, I welcomed the opportunity to point this out and make the field aware of it as well.

Contrasting startlingly in tone to the latter three comments was one, which, implying much the same message, did so in rather more robust terms. Asked to define her motive in writing, a very distinguished participant indeed replied:

- To tell them politely they were full of beans.

11.3. The feeling factor

The language perceived in parts of the above section began to let slip the generic mask of linguistic urbanity worn by Readers and Authors in their Forum texts. When asked directly about their emotions as they wrote, the mask slipped even further in three cases at least where there was real anger detectable:

- My first reaction was to feel very angry, very angry. I feel (sic) as if I were being screwed over, to use a vernacular phrase, by someone who, because he was working at, with publications, appears to be so superior to someone living and working..... I definitely felt powerless, especially as I thought the TESOL Q was publishing her attack because they were in agreement with her. So I was very pissed off.
- I was angry.. I was shocked at the careless refereeing at TESOL. Sorry, Chris, I know I am venting and you are just asking for objective details.
- I was angry because of the tone. It was unprofessional and mean-spirited, and maybe a little self-righteous.

What a purely textual analysis fails fully to lay bare is the emotional charge which clearly lurks beneath the surface linguistic structures of some Forum pieces. When uncovered here, we note the dichotomy between the sometimes anodyne language of the published text and the distinctly more visceral feelings present at the moment of reading and creation. While in Forum texts the focus is directed largely (but not exclusively) *ad rem*, a much more rounded picture of the whole nature of academic debate (or rather, its more normally hidden side) can be built up by listening to the private *ad hominem* remarks of some of the participants:

- She was critical of a colleague that I deeply respect and collaborate with. She was not only critical of her work, but her tone was mean-spirited in a personal way.
- In my opinion, the author's reply was (typically) off the point in many respects and much below the belt which is not unusual when it comes to some people who work in ESL in

Personal prejudices as well as personal animosities are also evident:

- While I am very happy to engage in critical debate with scholars who have had to confront research at “the coalface”, I am less sympathetic to the critique of scholars (particularly male) who have remained distant from the hurly-burly of data collection and analysis.

While the personal feelings which we have seen underpinning responses so far have been largely anger/irritation-derived, more constructive emotions are evident also, but not always with positive results:

- I thought (and still think) that the author of the trigger text fundamentally misunderstood the theoretical frame I was using and I tried to correct what I considered an ‘easy’ shot at the theory without actually saying the author had completely missed the point. I modulated my response because I knew the author of the comment, and did not wish to alienate or really critique her response. So I tried to craft my response in a nuanced way, moving quickly from our area of disagreement to matters that I thought were less controversial. I think the strategy, by the way, backfired. I know that the author and perhaps other readers think that the criticism she made was well-taken.

Here the intrusion of the affective dimension governed text construction in a way that worked against the writer’s initial intentions and left these intentions unfulfilled.

Freedman and Medway (1994) talk of how stultification and frustration was not infrequently reported by employees involved in the production of genre-driven documents. Standing back from these ‘off the cuff’ comments and observing them in parallel with the published texts, we might ask ourselves if writers found the representational requirements (or what they felt to be the representational requirements) of *TESOL Quarterly’s* Forum oppressive, given the discrepancy between the private affective element and the public text. With the exception of one participant who felt that these academic exchanges could be ‘stuffy and complacent’, no one commented negatively on the construct itself. Indeed, the angriest of the

participants (“So I was very pissed off.”) eventually confessed to seeing the usefulness of generic behaviour to her published response:

I knew exactly what was needed if I wanted to appear to be an academic, or a professional of any sort. I knew I could not lash out, even though one might think that deserved it. I had to appear to be at least at his level in my ability to use the generic response, but ideally even better. Politeness can after all “kill” very well.

Despite no diminution in the underlying venom – “Politeness can after all ‘kill’ very well” – the participant saw that the upper hand could be gained by recourse to generic action.

Moreover, having sampled some of the more forthright statements of the Readers and Authors, we see that the generic constraints (if constraints they be, in fact) help avoid what could be communicative failure by translating the more destructive personal feelings into community-recognised generic constructs which allow the interchange to continue. Indeed, as one participant above reported, even the more positive emotions when permitted to enter the text deflected her from her intended message. While occasional flashes of spirit testify that our texts are not emotion-free, the generic construct of the intertextual critical exchange helps serve to deflect the worst excesses of animus and to provide a community-recognised pattern of practice for continuing debate.

11.4. The odd couple

Of the 15 respondents, there was only one pairing of Reader and Author. We have already seen in our textual analysis a strong tendency for Readers and Authors alike to entrench themselves in their own positions rather than take onboard new information. An exposure to their private comments illuminated even further the gap

that existed between the two parties. By examining the table below we see that the apparently irreconcilable divergences in the public positions of a Reader and an Author (demonstrated already in their texts) are further reinforced by seeing how totally each party fails to understand how that public position was arrived at or, indeed, how each writer interpreted the exchange.

READER	AUTHOR
1a It was clear in my mind after reading this article that had not read the L1 research onIn simplest terms, I was responding not so much to her intentions but to her very careless research.	1b The {title of the article} was really not the “hard core research” that the TQ favors today. Certainly it had a point of view, but the opinions weren’t grounded in empirical research. Rather it was an explication of and reflection on what I had found in my teaching – I guess I would call it “classroom research.”
2a I am not proud of the strategy I used in my argument – I attacked her claims with counter-attacks on her theoretical position. I did not, as I should have, stuck to refuting her claims.	2b His response was a mixture of questions and comments; he sought explication and discussion. What more could a fellow writing colleague ask?..
3a After I read my response in print, I wasn’t entirely proud of my arguments. Some of my students and a few colleagues felt I was attacking her personally. That wasn’t my intention but I did at times sound strident in my attacks and that I find regrettable.	3b This was not my first ‘response to a response’, but it was by far the most pleasant. I knew and respected his teaching philosophy. When the 2 ‘responses were published I was pleased. brought up important controversies without accusations or condescension.

Table 19. Comparison of Reader/Author comments on exchange

In 1a and 1b we see that the Reader fails entirely to understand the action research paradigm within which the Author was working nor does the Author realize that much of this dispute is triggered by this failure. Their private comments illuminate this discrepancy in a way that is never clear in the public text. Were this so, we feel that the philosophical impasse between Reader and Author would have been, if not avoided, at least reduced.

2a and 2b are even more alarming in illustrating the scant understanding of at least one party to realize what was happening in the text. The Reader, rightly, sees his action as being based on a series of counterattacks (what we have called counterclaims in our analysis); the Author sees that response as a “mixture of questions and comments.” In fact, the Reader’s reading of the text is the more accurate. What the Author fails to say is that she, too, counterclaimed as much as the Reader. Textual evidence of the Reader’s seeking ‘explication and discussion’ is hard to find. What is more evident is the displacive discourse of both parties.

When we arrive at 3a and 3b our bewilderment is complete. While the Author is charmed by this “most pleasant” interchange “free from accusations or condescension”, the Reader is somewhat ashamed of what he feels was his “strident” attacks which he now labels “regrettable”.

11.5. Reviewing behaviour

From the point of view of textual analysis, we saw that there was not a great deal of receptivity to ‘the other voice’ in these public interchanges. By looking at the private comments of Readers and Authors, we begin to see why. For these rhetorically rehearsed texts conceal a wealth of strong emotion and unshakeable inner conviction carefully honed for public consumption into the language of what might pass for academic debate. But surely this conviction manifested by Reader and Author alike of being the Primary Knower is inimical to true debate? Even more inimical to academic debate is the failure to understand - or perhaps *want* to understand what the other party is doing or seeking to do.

I have carefully avoided the use of the term “dialogue” in describing what is going on in these texts, for a productive dialogue implies an exchange of ideas which develops into an outcome greater and richer than its initial propositions. Here we have rather a confrontation of opposing propositions which lead us really nowhere. True, the issues have been aired for public consumption but have they been illuminated or rendered even more opaque? One Reader, reviewing his interchange in retrospect summed it up this way:

...the whole experience left me feeling that it was futile in a way. certainly didn't change her point of view in any way and I'm not sure the readers did either. It may be like the death penalty; you're either for it or against it and no argument is going to change your mind.

We understand his disappointment at the failure of the Author and reading public to change their points of view, but what even this thoughtful Reader fails to consider is that a change in *his* point of view figures, ironically, nowhere on his own agenda.

11.6. The consultation evaluated

In their richness and spontaneity, the private responses of the participants added a valuable dimension to the study. The results of my textual analysis were, I felt, substantially confirmed by the reflections of the Readers and Authors themselves.

By this point in the research, I was fairly sure that my hypothesis that the texts I had been studying merited the title of a sub-genre at the very least. Nevertheless, it was reassuring to hear many the participants underpin the textual analysis in various ways with their own more subjective comments on genre and how they perceived its workings here.

As for my contention that the strong desire to be accorded Primary Knower status by TQ community was a driving force in many participants, this, too, was substantially borne out by the haughty disdain often evinced for interlocutors and their intellectual capacities. A number of Readers and Authors saw it as “setting the record straight” with no hedging comments of false modesty. What emerged from all the private comments was an overwhelming feeling of their own ‘rightness’ which the passage of time had done little to shake.

It became clear, too, that the genre served a useful purpose in deflecting discourse-destroying anger and transfiguring it into a more well-mannered community-recognized construct. Whether, however, this construct actually facilitated real dialogue will be discussed more fully in a later chapter.

I am deeply grateful to all the responding Readers and Authors for their willingness to contribute so openly to research into the intertextual critical exchange. Their participation was as helpful as it was disarmingly honest.

12. ACADEMIC DEBATE OR PROGRAMMED CONTENTIOUSNESS?

Coming towards the end of this generic exploration of the intertextual critical exchange, we are confronted with a number of questions. These now no longer concern the generic status of the texts we have analyzed but look beyond such matters to the social implications of this text-type. These questions concern rather the representation of academic debate that this genre constructs. What kind of ideational and social organization do such exchanges keep in place? Is there not the possibility that, far from opening up the issue as is commonly claimed, such interchanges merely cancel each other out and bemuse those interested but less informed than the participants? In whose interest does this genre operate? Can academic discussion not be advanced less adversarially? In short, how constructive a genre is the intertextual critical exchange?

12.1 The ICE :the socio-historic context

It would be wrong to conclude from our exploration of these *TESOL Quarterly* texts that we have inadvertently stumbled upon a unique group of querulous individuals somewhat given to fault-finding and squabbling among themselves. They are merely operating within the 'forum' tradition of western public debating life whereby the setting up of two adversarial sides of an issue will surely lead - or so the orthodoxy runs - to the 'truth' emerging. We have here an example of it taken from a learned journal. But we might just as easily have cited the parliamentary debating structure in Britain, America or any other two-party

democracy. Or taken an example from the way public issues are debated on the airwaves of western broadcasting media. This agonistic tradition would appear to stem from a misunderstanding of the Socratic 'elenchos' which today is generally interpreted as the setting up of an adversarial paradigm of parrying and refuting an opponent's ideas while defending one's own, with the ultimate aim of showing oneself in the right and the adversary in the wrong. If we look more carefully at the Socratic 'elenchos', however, we note that its aim was not to show the adversary up as being wrong but rather more to convince others and lead them to a new insight. For Moulton (1983:156)

..the justification of the elenchos is not that it subjects claims to the most extreme opposition, but that it shakes people up about their cherished convictions so they can begin philosophical inquiries with a more open mind.

Put another way, the hope was to change minds, not win debating points.

(Tannen 1999)

So, are we saying that the readers of the 'Forum' section of *TESOL Quarterly* have been witnesses to a classically adversarial paradigm at work or to an interactive process which has shaken them up, to paraphrase Moulton, and led them to a new insight? The conclusion of this study, as has been hinted at already, tends towards the former. Texts RR5 and AR5 stand out as notable exceptions to this conclusion in that Reader and Author have listened to the other's argument, built on it by refining certain aspects of its thought and delivered to the reading public a revitalized version of the original, redolent with collegial, shared insights. Sadly, however, this critical exchange stands as a generic 'sport' amongst its neighbours, who prefer to field their

own unrevised views in the Primary Knower stakes and to displace rather than take onboard new information or consider different approaches.

It would be superficial to condemn too harshly the devotees of this seemingly automatic reaction to a publicly floated opinion i.e. to look immediately to criticize. After all, as we have suggested earlier, the tradition of much public debate relies on 'forum' discussions of the kind we have been studying here. We live in a culture of contentious debate that is programmed around the airing of opposing views, as if mutually exclusive view-points and differing approaches necessarily reveal the 'truth' of an issue. Ong (1981:24) refers to this agonistic tradition as 'programmed contentiousness'. Tannen (2002:1652) talks of it as 'ritualized adversativeness'.

Of course, for some, there is much that is attractive in this. By setting up dichotomies they feel that a 'balance' of information is being presented. But what is unproductive - and sometimes dangerous - in this is that such an adversarial approach may well conceal significant common ground whose development could be mutually enlightening to the contestants - and perhaps much more importantly - to the listeners to the discussion. In Tannen's (2002:1651) view this contentious approach is 'a source of..obfuscation of knowledge' by ignoring what is sound and sensible in favour of the automaticity of attack which seeks out for comment only the weakest points (or, rather, what are seen as the weakest points) in an otherwise sound contribution.

We have here a genre suggesting an ideational and social world arranged around intellectual stasis. There is the illusion of a debate, yet can debate truly take place when the two protagonists are listening - if at all - only to take issue with what

they don't like? The common ground – which may well be considerable – is lost, as, indeed, may well be the readers.

This is not so say that either party is totally unaware of the existence of shared views or common ground that may exist. The generic move in the introduction that acknowledged the contribution positively hinted at such awareness. But as we noted, such comments tended to sound a routine note and seemed more a nod in the direction of politeness rather than a hint of more constructive developments in the upcoming discussion. We remember, too, that in information structure terms, the criticism rather than the compliment enjoyed the strong final position in the language of this move. The conclusion we draw from all this is that in this genre divisive argument is preferred over integrative reflection.

12.2. The ICE : the systemic context

Before becoming over-pessimistic too soon about the overall state of academic debate as instantiated by this model of it, we must quickly recall that the intertextual critical exchange is only one genre in a system of genres, to use again Bazerman's expression. Swales (1990:177) devotes a chapter to what he calls the 'spider's web' of 'research-process genres'. Curiously, as we have earlier noted, although Swales lists abstracts, presentations, grant proposals, theses and dissertations, books and monographs and, of course, RAs themselves as key members of this system of genres, he omits any mention whatsoever of the genre here under discussion. Such an omission is perhaps not surprising given that the prominence given to the research article genre has tended to overshadow other members of the research-process system of genres as he himself concedes:

There is little doubt that, even in a state of considerable ignorance, we know much more about the RA than other research process genres. (1990:177)

But although the victim of Swalesian eclipse, the intertextual critical exchange undoubtedly has its place in the system of academic discourse. Yet, without embarking on an exhaustive socio-cognitive and linguistic exploration of the above genres, members of the academic discourse community must be struck instantly by the great discrepancy between the positioning of 'self' in the intertextual critical exchange when compared with those other genres mentioned.

In abstracts, distillation is of the essence and the concept of the writing 'self' is totally absent. In presentations, however, the situation is rather different:

.....the presenter is much more of a person, indeed one who can tell tales against him- or herself often to good rhetorical effect..... (Swales 1990:186)

The presentation of 'self' is here seen as a key factor in successful listener orientation and content narration. In the same way, allowing for the differences between the spoken and the written, the presentation of 'self' in research articles, theses and dissertations is equally important, although the writer can be more of an abstracted, calculated persona than the presenter. Nevertheless, careful positioning of 'self' with regard to past authority and new claims is primordial for obtaining collegial approval. The academic world, after all, as Myers explains, is one:

...in which only claims accepted by the consensus have authority. (Myers 1989:30)

In research articles, theses and dissertations, even when researchers are obliged to step out of the consensual to point to what they believe to be incorrect or inadequate knowledge claims by fellow researchers, a solid framework of negative

and positive politeness strategies is carefully constructed around the potentially offending comments (Myers 1989, Hunston 1993).

Grant proposals and reprint requests, the remaining members of Swales' web of 'research-process genres', require a similar regard for the positioning of a courteous 'self' in their bid to engineer favourable reader-evaluator response.

Now, while the concept of a collegially acceptable 'self' is far from ignored in the intertextual critical exchange, as the many manoeuvrings for reader approval we have earlier listed testify, when the debate is fully engaged, the need to displace appears to outweigh the social obligation to be polite in a way that is unique in this system of research-process genres.

Even more disturbing, perhaps, is the fact that the need to displace outweighs any attempt at engineering collaborative positioning which might integrate individual preferences within a broader common purpose, to the greater common good of the practising teacher/researcher reading *TESOL Quarterly* with a view to improving his/her pedagogical/investigative skills.

We are far from the Socratic 'elenchos' in which the purpose of 'forum' discussion is to convince others and lead the listener to new insights. Here, rather, the emphasis, as we have shown, is on insisting on the rightness of one's own position and revisiting old arguments. If both protagonists fail themselves to obtain new insight from their interchange, it is difficult to see how this can be accomplished by the reading public witnessing such an impasse of the conflictual. More heat than light is generated by this collision of ideas.

12.3. Counting the cost

This fairly unproductive situation perhaps stems from a confusion between disagreement and argument, as Cameron (2000) points out:

It is acknowledged that people may disagree with one another, but there is a difference between disagreement and argument. The latter challenges the validity of others' opinions, but seeks to persuade them to change. In plainer language, arguments are won and lost. (p.163)

While we have certainly seen plenty of evidence of contributors seeking to challenge 'the validity of others' opinions', have we seen much in the way of efforts aimed at persuading others to change their opinions? Rather, we have seen the emphasis more on challenges followed by re-entrenchment by the challenged on their own perspectives. Put simply, they have agreed to disagree rather than to engage in real argument in the classical rhetorical tradition.

To help explain this impasse, Badger (2004:17) puts forward reasons of structure:

...the structure of this kind of argument may also be a contributory factor in the apparent lack of development. By setting up the argument as a dialogue in which the same person has the opening and closing move, the editors of these journals have made the possibility of an agreed outcome to the argument very unlikely. It would be interesting to see what would happen if editors required that the final argument, the feedback in my terms, had to be written jointly by both sets of authors.

While Badger's bid for collegiality in the final text is surely to be welcomed here, the enormous input of time, co-operation and editorial creativity required to bring this about might appear to rule this out as a practical solution.

Of all the *public* genres in this system of research-process genres, this is the one that could come closest to direct academic interplay between two parties, albeit generically codified in part. It is all the more depressing, therefore, that given this rare

opportunity for such personal interaction in the system of research-process genres, the participants tend to seize upon highlighting dissension rather than developing common beliefs, upon foregrounding perceived weaknesses rather than evident strengths and upon seeking to displace rather than to augment. Furthermore, this is often accompanied by bald-on-record face-threatening acts of personal and professional criticism.

While deploring this negation of opportunity, we must recall that these uncollegial characteristics are unique to this particular genre in the system of research-process genres. Elsewhere in the system we see claims and criticism hedged around with a raft of negative and positive politeness strategies which show academics up in a much more positive light.

Nevertheless, the generic performance of academics in the intertextual critical exchange cannot be said to be an asset to academia in broadening academic discussion. For when such behaviour has come to be a generic norm, who is encouraged to take part in the debate? These interchanges, in their present condition, are for those who enjoy the cut and thrust of polemical interaction and, while this in itself is no criticism of those who enjoy it, professional experience tells us that there are very many proficient participants in the field of ESOL teaching who do not feel at all comfortable in such an approach to discussion. Herring (1996) confirms this by research she conducted on a rancorous polarized debate which erupted on an electronic 'linguist' list. 73 percent of respondents who indicated they had not taken part said they had abstained from a sense of 'intimidation' (Tannen 2002). Consequently, the opting out of such professionals impoverishes academic debate by

leaving the field to the more strident and self-confident but not necessarily to the more enlightened.

12.4. Finding alternative ways

Although our research material has been taken from an American-based journal with one of the texts written as recently as 2002, such an adversarial approach to intertextual critical exchanges is no stranger to other countries, including Britain, and enjoys a long historical pedigree. Anthony Trollope writing in 1857 of the internecine debate between Mr. Arabin and Mr. Slope in “Barchester Towers” remarks of them:

For some time past Mr. Arabin had been engaged in a tremendous controversy with no less a person than Mr. Slope, respecting the apostolic succession. These two gentlemen had never seen each other, but they had been extremely bitter in print. Mr. Slope had endeavoured to strengthen his cause by calling Mr. Arabin an owl, and Mr. Arabin had retaliated by hinting that Mr. Slope was an infidel. ...The matter had become too tedious for the readers of the *Jupiter*, and a little note had therefore been appended to one of Mr. Slope’s most telling rejoinders, in which it had been stated that no further letters from the reverend gentlemen could be inserted except as advertisements.

Other methods of publication were, however, found less expensive than advertisements in the *Jupiter*; and the war went on merrily.

Now, while specific mentions of owls and infidels figure nowhere in *TESOL Quarterly*, the polemical spirit of Mr. Arabin and Mr. Slope is surely still alive in the interchanges we have explored here. And far from finding the Arabin/Slope interchanges enlightening, the *Jupiter* readers here mentioned found them ‘tedious’. In the same vein, we wonder what the reaction of *TESOL Quarterly* readers to, say, the Amy Schlessman/Karen Johnson interchange was? Was the interchange conclusively positive? Or, as it went on ‘merrily’, did the ‘war’ leave the academic equivalent of collateral damage in the form of reader confusion, exasperation and disengagement?

But if apparently ‘t’was ever thus’ in the Anglo-Saxon world, there are hints that other world rhetorics through the ages have regarded academic engagement otherwise. Oliver (1971) reports that while Socratic ‘elenchos’ held sway in classical Athens, the preferred mode of rhetorical engagement in both India and China was to enlighten the inquirer and not to overwhelm the opponent and the way of doing this was to respect the earnestness of investigation rather than espouse the fervour of conviction, ideas to which we shall return shortly. Young (1994) backs this up when she talks of Chinese scholars seeing our diverse universe as a fragile one which requires that efforts should be made to integrate conflicting ideas and to investigate potential links between them rather than seeking to negate them by bald-on-record opposition. (This perhaps helps explain the curious yet seemingly successful hybrid marriage of capitalism and communism we see today in post-Maoist China.)

While Western approaches to academic debate can only benefit from further exposure to such Eastern influences, there are cautious signs that the West has itself already realized that traditional approaches to critical exchanges would benefit from some re-appraisal of how interaction can be conducted in the academic world.

In Sharkey & Johnson (2003) - the same Johnson we have discovered in more adversarial form earlier in this document – we find the following in the preface:

I wanted to...demonstrate how classroom teachers, teacher educators and teacher candidates used their knowledge of the classroom when reading scholarly texts, engaging the text in ways that led to new thinking about teaching and learning. I did not want a project that would just replicate the argumentative model of “a reader reacts” common to many scholarly journals (i.e, the space where someone writes in to point out the flaws of an argument). (x-xi)

Here the engagement with the text takes the form not of a ‘forum’ debate of the kind we have been studying but of a dialogue, a term that features in the title of

this project itself –*The TESOL Quarterly Dialogues*. The writer sees the dialogues of their text as the antithesis of the ‘a reader reacts’ model which, interestingly, she glosses as

..the space where someone writes in to point out the flaws of an argument.

While we have shown that, in fact, quite a lot more goes on in these texts, we will understand how she came to view intertextual critical exchanges in this way and could not criticize anyone for coming away from these texts with this impression. Not that the dialogues are anything *other* than intertextual critical exchanges, but in a new re-invigorated form which reminds us of Tannen’s (1999) comment:

..although criticizing is surely part of critical thinking, it is not synonymous with it.
(p.281)

In *The TESOL Quarterly Dialogues* we have a format that in some ways is not dissimilar to the tripartite unit we have been studying. Here, too, there is a research article which initiates the discussion, reactions from readers and a final comment from the writer of the original article. There, however, the resemblance stops. For the reader who contributes to the discussion does not do so ‘to point out the flaws of an argument’ (Sharkey & Johnson 2003 pp. x-xi) but rather to ‘describe how the TQ articles caused them to rethink or reconceptualize learning and teaching issues’ (Sharkey & Johnson 2003 p ix). The authors, for their part, return to the discussion to make a final reflection on the readers’ remarks stemming from these rethinks or reconceptualizations. The emphasis here is not so much on displacement or debate as on augmentation and dialogue.

Two of the authors we have been discussing – Bonny Norton Peirce, and Kelleen Toohey – figure in this publication. Interestingly, the Bonny Norton Peirce article – *Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning* - which aroused the comments of Stephen Price in our “Forum” text appears again in Sharkey & Johnson (2003) and elicited comments this time from Judith Sharkey. Quotations from both readers illuminate cogently the differences in the style of interaction of both approaches:

Stephen Price (RR4) Whether Peirce overcomes the dichotomy of language learner/learning context is questionable, as is, consequently, whether she raises the most pertinent and pressing questions that poststructural theory raises for second language acquisition (SLA) theory.

Borrowing from Weedon, Peirce asserts “the multiple nature of the subject; subjectivity as a site of struggle; and subjectivity as changing” (p.15). Fundamental to her argument is the application of these characteristics to social identity. But this theoretical conflation of subjectivity and identity weakens her own position because it blinds her to the practical distinction she in fact necessarily continues to make.

Here we have the reader as pointer out of flaws, or, at least, flaws perceived by the reader. In the first paragraph, two questions are raised about the author’s success in handling certain issues and in the second she is seen as being confused about another. When reader Judith Sharkey ‘reacts’ in Sharkey and Johnson (2003 p.57), the tone is very different:

Judith Sharkey When I first read “Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning”, I was in the middle of the first year of a 3-year contract teaching at a small junior college halfway between Osaka and Kyoto, Japan. Bonny’s article stimulated immediate reflection.

By articulating the complexity of identity and how power operates in social interactions, Bonny gave me the language to reexamine my past experiences and practices.

Here we have the reader as pointer out of strengths, someone who underlines the author’s usefulness to a practising teacher. Another reader of the same article, Ling Shi, reacts in similarly positive vein:

Ling Shi Reading Bonny's reconceptualizing of SLA in terms of a complex relationship among power, identity, and environment was one of those moments of enlightenment that enabled me to understand the experiences of ESL students such as Wong.

Equally interesting is Peirce's response to these reactions:

Bonny Norton Peirce Judy, Ling..., like me, are seeking a better understanding of the conditions under which language learners speak..... At the same time we are interested in the human agency of learners....

Caring and sharing classrooms do not just happen, however. As Beth's commentary powerfully demonstrates, teachers have an important part to play in creating safe spaces in which students can engage in critical reflection.... Equally interesting was Judy's, Ling's, and Beth's understanding of power and identity.. Like Judy, I have often reflected on those instances in my life, as a student, teacher, scholar, and graduate advisor, in which, for better or worse, power relations have structured my interaction with others.

Her interaction with Stephen Price, however, is different in tone, failing entirely to find *his* understanding of power and identity "equally interesting" and ends on the somewhat waspish:

I hope that Price's interest in theory is complemented by a passion for research.

The fact that 'Peirce' becomes 'Bonny' symbolizes neatly much of the difference in approach of readers in the 'Forum' and in the 'Dialogues'. In the latter we are struck by the emphasis on the positive attitude towards the trigger text by the readers, the appreciation of the text's strengths and usefulness, and by the collegiality ('Judy,...like me,' 'Like Judy, I have...', 'At the same time we...') of the author to her readers and her respect for her readers' perceptions ('Equally interesting was Judy's, Ling's and Beth's understanding of power...')

In vain do we wait for the 'But,...' or the 'However,...' , so familiar in follow-up position to any favourable comment to be found in the 'Forum'. We are here close to some of the Eastern ideas about academic discussion which were mentioned earlier in this chapter in that we notice a total absence of the fervour of one

personal conviction set up in opposition to another, but rather a respect for and interest in the investigations of colleagues involved with similar challenges in very different teaching environments. It is the common ground between author and reader that is explored to the enrichment of other EFL teachers/researchers. Strengths are celebrated rather than flaws insisted upon, links are sought rather than divisions foregrounded and a sense of creative development rather than negating impasse engendered.

It would surely be ill-advised, however, to read too much into the appearance of a single text and to anticipate any sea-change in critical thinking as result of this publication exercise. But such ideas do not usually emerge from a vacuum. The fact that 27 Readers and 9 Authors (two of them represented in the texts we have studied here) were prepared to engage in such a project suggests that guided collegial dialogue has at least found a foot-hold in the publishing sphere, one all the stronger for being established in a publishing house as influential as that of TESOL Inc. Reinforcing the work of Sharkey & Johnson a year later came Hawkins & Irujo (2004) whose focus on collaborative conversations among language teacher educators further placed the emphasis on dialogue rather than polemic, as did the earlier collegial exchanges in Johnson and Golombek (2002).

And given the fact that such departures, whether knowingly or unknowingly, draw support from the centuries-old Eastern academic tradition that generously respects the earnestness of the investigation of others and looks to integrate rather than explode ideas, suggests that it has a thoroughly well-founded pedigree, drawing

as it does on a tradition as long but perhaps not so well known in the Western academic world as our own rhetorical model.

12.5. Enlarging the forum

We have spent much time stressing the extent of the discursive divide that separates our “Forum” texts from the contributions in the *Dialogues*. This should not blind us to the fact both sets of texts still belong to a single community and that both are examples of very different kinds of intertextual critical exchanges. Indeed, we noted that certain writers contributed to both sets of texts. There is, as Miller (1993a) reminds us, only one *polis* despite the differences that may separate its citizens and that they form a single rhetorical community willy-nilly. Farrell refers to this community as the rhetorical forum:

What is critical to the power and constraint of the forum is that two very different sorts of loci may always intersect there: first, is the cumulative weight of customary practice: convention, commonplace and *communis sensus* associated with the forum’s own history; and second, the inevitably uncertain fact of otherness. (1991:198)

Farrell’s perspective on what constitutes a rhetorical forum prompts us to ask to what extent the *TESOL Quarterly* Forum is represented by this definition. For, as Miller (1994:74) reminds us:

It is this inclusion of sameness and difference, of us and them, of centripetal and centrifugal impulses that make a community rhetorical, for rhetoric in essence requires both agreement and dissent, shared understandings and novelty, enthymematic premises and contested claims....In a paradoxical way, a rhetorical community includes the ‘other’.

Clearly, the *TESOL Quarterly* Forum well represents ‘the other’ or, put another way, one half of this rhetorical context, for it gives ample scope for Readers and Authors alike to demonstrate ‘difference’, ‘centrifugal impulses’, ‘dissent’, ‘novelty’ and ‘contested claims’. What is either taken for granted or not taken into

account at all in these intertextual critical exchanges which we find in *TESOL Quarterly* is that there *may be* an important body of common ground constructed around ‘agreement’, ‘shared understandings’ and ‘enthymematic claims’ which is simply not represented here and of whose existence we are reminded by the *Dialogues*.

Traditionally, only one half of the forum dynamic – the dissenting half - has found favour in this research-process genre, giving to the editor, as it does, ‘good copy’ in the shape of crisply worded contested claims and the illusion that a balance of information is being disseminated. What perhaps is more difficult to accept is that only the weaknesses (or, rather, perceived weaknesses) find discussion room in such an exchange and the contribution’s strengths – of which the writer may be well aware – are often simply largely ignored, apart from in some anodyne words of faint praise in the opening move. The interested but less informed common reader is thus robbed of the opportunity of having the strengths confirmed – and thus usefully corroborated for adoption into his/her own teaching praxis. Only with the inclusion of the approach adopted in the *Dialogues* do we see the forum of the kind discussed by Farrell and Miller made whole.

We began this chapter with a series of questions ending in: how constructive a genre is the intertextual critical exchange? In answer, we must accept that it *does* perform a useful function in that error and weaknesses in arguments and approaches cannot be ignored any more in academia than they can be in the world at large. The fervour of conviction can be a blindingly dangerous sentiment, as our television screens and newspapers daily remind us. Cameron points out:

The 'best' answer to someone who asserts that the earth is flat (or who wants school science text books to teach us that God created the world in six days) surely cannot be 'that's your opinion and you're entitled to it'. (2000:163)

Leaving unchallenged the intellectually unsound is not a formula for long-term progress or stability. In a sense, the intertextual critical exchanges evident in *TESOL Quarterly* attempt to come to grips with this situation, but, as we have attempted to show, the impasse of dissent is usually more obvious than the evolution of argument.

Such rhetorical behaviour, however, whatever its merits in striving for the elimination of perceived error, constructs a community that lists rather heavily to one side – the side of contention. Of course, a kind of balance *does* exist within this domain of contention, but it is the micro-balance of warring dichotomies. What surely is needed to correct this lop-sidedness is to add to forum-type discussions exchanges which explore enthymematic premises as well as contested claims, exchanges which *narrate* ongoing and various experiences as well as exchanges which *debate* conflicting ideas, exchanges which celebrate heterogeneity in a common pursuit rather than pursue agonism for its own sake. (Sharkey & Johnson 2003; Hawkins & Ijuro 2004; Johnson & Golombek 2002; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, 1995, 1991; Casanave and Schecter 1997; Bruner, 1996; Carter, 1993; Butt and Raymond, 1989)

Those in favour of a greater role for narration are not necessarily at odds with the traditional content of intertextual critical exchanges. Johnson & Golombek (2002:12) are at pains to point out that they:

...believe that narrative inquiry enables teachers to organize, articulate, and communicate what they know and believe about teaching.

In organizing, articulating and communicating what they know and believe about teaching these teachers/researchers are not straying far from the discussion parameters of the “Forum” texts; what *is* different is the style and emphasis with which the discussion proceeds. Collegial reflection on the wider canvas of lived experience (and the professional insights gained thereby) replaces predictably polemical engagement on a narrow range of Reader/Author selected issues. Johnson & Golombek (2002:15) are confident that the professional and linguistic knowledge, so heatedly challenged and jealously defended in “Forum” ICEs, is not under threat from their ideas:

We are not proposing that narrative inquiry replace one dominant paradigm with another.

Rather, in drawing attention to the usefulness and desirability of increased attention to narrative inquiry, they seek merely to relocate the emphasis somewhat.

..teachers’ stories are a journey of *how* they know as well as *what* they know. (p.15)

This increased emphasis on the *how* is a balancing and enriching addition to the *what* factor in such exchanges, which latter has perhaps held too dominant a sway until recently.

The introduction of the narrative to what has tended in our culture to be the domain largely of the contentious would not only stimulate and enrich reflection by the contemplation of other lives and contexts, but demonstrate the heterogeneity and validity of all lived experience. It is an approach which celebrates differences rather than argues over them, as Rouse (1990:185) points out:

Sharing a situation as a narrative field thus makes possible meaningful differences along with convergence. The need to make differences intelligible and a common project

possible compels an ongoing struggle to keep in check the divergence of versions of the community's story.... This struggle takes the form of a shared concern to construct, enforce, and conform to a common narrative which gives sense to everyone's endeavor.

The need to make differences intelligible and to give sense to everyone's endeavour is surely a fine watchword for future change.

12.6. The *polis* enfranchised, the community empowered

And change is something which this genre that we have been exploring surely needs. On the positive side we have heard from the contributors themselves that it can modify and help mask anger and hostility of the kind that could precipitate complete communicative breakdown. What is more, serious error, or what is felt to be serious error, is corrected by such interventions, although one could argue that responsible refereed journals have the resources to filter these out before publication. Furthermore, intertextual critical exchanges also stimulate and elicit contrary views which inaugurate a form of public debate.

But it is the nature of this debate which is ultimately troubling. For the focus is firmly on what are perceived weaknesses in argument or information rather than on more general strengths, thus distracting disproportionately the general reading public's attention from what might have been an otherwise sound and useful contribution. Furthermore, by parrying competing claims in this adversarial way, this polarizing of issues risks bemusing the same reading public and, consequently, the so-called 'opening up' of issues (often somewhat narrow ones in the first place) has the reverse effect of closing them down, as they cancel each other out in the readers' minds. Since Reader and Author fail to change or revitalize their positions as a result

of their interchange, it seems unlikely that the more general reader has been led to a new, reinvigorated insight either. There is the added concern that the participants in these interchanges represent only a certain type of mind-set in the discourse community, for the largely polemical tone of many of these interchanges appeals only to those potential participants that are at home in the clash of perspectives – and the daily life of most EFL professionals is stressful enough without going home to engage in further adversarial combat.

In its present format, this genre represents only part of a true forum – the part which foregrounds differences and dissent rather than convergence and agreement. If the forum is serious about representing fully the voice of the *polis* that is the discourse community of the world of TESOL/Applied Linguistics, then the said forum neglects collegial experience and shared beliefs at its peril.

Until the fertile, but as yet largely untended, common ground between the lonely peaks of ‘truth’ and ‘rebuttal’ as represented in these intertextual critical exchanges is taken into cultivation and developed to the benefit of *all* the citizens of the *polis*, the intertextual critical exchange will explore only part of its productive potential as a research-process genre. And Mr. Slope’s war will continue merrily on.



Reproduced by kind permission of Universal Press Syndicate

References

- Ard, J. 1983. The role of the author in scientific discourse. Paper given at the annual American Applied Linguistics Meeting, Minneapolis, Minn. December 1983.
- _____. 1985. Vantage points for the analysis of scientific discourse.
English for Specific Purposes. 4. pp. 3-20.
- Atkinson, D. 2002. A reader reacts... *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(1) pp.79-84.
- Austin, J. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. linguistics. In M. Baynham, A. Deignan and G. White (eds.)
Applied linguistics at the interface. (pp.11-28). London: BAAL/Equinox.
- Badger, R. 2004. The agonism and the ecstasy: conflict and argument in applied
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1986. The problem of speech genres. In M. Holquist (ed.)
Speech genres and other late essays. (pp.60-112). Austin, TX:
University of Texas Press.
- Barabas, C. 1990. *Technical writing in a corporate culture: a study of the nature of information*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Barber, C. L. 1962. Some measurable characteristics of scientific prose.
Contributions to English syntax and phonology. Stockholm:
Almqvist & Wiksell. pp.1-23.
- Bazerman, C. 1984. The writing of scientific non-fiction: contexts, choices, constraints. *PRE/TEXT* 5. 39-74.
- _____. 1988. *Shaping written knowledge: the genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. 1994b. Systems of genres and the enactment of social intentions.
In A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds.) *Genre and the new rhetoric*.
(pp. 79-101). London: Taylor and Francis.
- de Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. 1981. *Introduction to text linguistics*
London: Longman.
- Bell Sinclair, J. 1995. The relationship between L1 and L2 literacy: some complicating factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(4) pp.687-704.
- _____. 1997. The author responds... *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1) pp.162-166
- Bellack, A.A., Kliebard, H.M., Hyman, R.T. and Smith, F.L. *The language of the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Berkenkotter, C. and Huckin, T.N. 1995. *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: cognition/culture/power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berry, M. 1981. Systemic linguistics and discourse analysis: a multi-layered approach to exchange structure. In Coulthard, R.M. and Montgomery, M.M. (eds.) *Studies in discourse analysis*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Beyer, L.E. 1988. *Knowing and acting: inquiry, ideology, and educational Studies*. Lewes: The Falmer Press.
- Bhatia, V.K. 1983. *An applied discourse analysis of English legislative writing*. Birmingham: LSU, University of Aston in Birmingham.
- _____. 1993. *Analysing genre: language use in professional settings*.

- London: Longman.
- _____. 1997. Genre-mixing in academic introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*. 16 (3) pp.181-196.
- _____. 2002. A generic view of academic discourse. In J.Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic Discourse* (pp21-39) London: Longman.
- _____. 2002a. E-mail received 14th November.
- _____. 2004. *Worlds of written discourse: a genre-based view*. London: Continuum.
- _____. 2004a E-mail received 9th September.
- Biber, D. and Finegan, E. 1989. Adverbial stance types in English. *Discourse Processes*. 11. pp.1-34.
- Bley-Vroman, R. and Selinker, T. 1984. Research design in rhetorical/grammatical studies: a proposed optimal research strategy. *English for Specific Purposes*. 82-83 (1-4) and 84 (1-6).
- Bolivar, A. 1994. The structure of newspaper editorials. In M. Coulthard (ed.) *Advances in written text analysis*. pp.276-294. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brown, J.D. and Hudson, T. 1998. The alternatives in language assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4) pp.653-675.
- _____. 1999. The authors respond... *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(4) pp.734-735.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness: some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruce, N.J. 1983. Rhetorical constraints on information structure in medical research report writing. Paper presented at the ESP in the Arab World Conference, University of Aston. August.
- Bruffee, K. A. 1986. Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: a bibliography. *College English* 48:773-90.
- Brumfit, C.J. 2001. *Individual freedom in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bruner, J. 1996. *The narrative construal of reality*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Bruton, A. 1999. A reader reacts... *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(4) pp.729-734.
- Burke, K. 1950. *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Butt, R.L. and Raymond, D. 1989. Studying the nature and development of teachers' knowledge using collaborative autobiography. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 13. 403-419.
- Bybee, J. and Fleischman, S. 1995. *Modality in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cameron, D. 2000. *Good to talk?* London: Sage.

- Candlin, C.N. and Plum, G.A. 1999 Engaging with challenges of interdiscursivity in academic writing: researchers, students and tutors, in C.N. Candlin and K. Hyland (eds.) *Writing: texts, processes and practices*. (pp.193-217) London: Longman.
- Carrell, P.L. 1983. Some issues in studying the role of schemata, or background knowledge, in second language comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 1:81-92.
- Carrell, P., Devine, J., and Eskey, D. (eds). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carson, J. G. 1998. Cultural backgrounds: what should we know about multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4) pp.735-740.
- Carter, K. 1993. The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher*. 22(1). pp.5-12.
- Casanave, C.P. and Schecter, S.R. 1997. (eds.) *On becoming a language educator: personal essays on professional development*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Christie, F. and Martin, J.R. 1997. (eds.) *Genre and institutions: social processes in the workplace and the school*. London: Cassell.
- Clandinin, D.J. and Connelly, F.M. 1991. Narrative and story in practice and research. In Schon, D.A. (ed.) *The reflective turn: case studies in and on educational practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- _____. 1995. Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: secret, sacred, and cover stories. In Connelly, F.M. and Clandinin, D.J. (eds.) *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- _____. 2000. *Narrative inquiry: experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coe, R.M. 1994. An arousing and fulfillment of desires: the rhetoric of genre in the process era – and beyond. In Freedman, A. and Medway, P. (eds.) pp.181-190. *Genre and the new rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Conrad, S. and Biber, D. 2000. Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. (pp.56-73). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, C. 1985. Aspects of article introductions in IEEE publications. Unpublished M.Sc. dissertation. University of Aston.
- Coulmas, F. 1979. On the sociolinguistic relevance of routine formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 3(3). pp.239-266.
- _____. 1981. *Conversational routine: exploration in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech*. The Hague.

- Coulthard, R. M. 1977. *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- _____. 1986. (ed.) *Talking about text: studies presented to David Brazil on his retirement*. Discourse Analysis Monographs No. 13. University of Birmingham: English Language Research.
- _____. 1994. (ed.) *Advances in written text analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, R.M. and Brazil, D. 1981. *Exchange structure*. University of Birmingham: English Language Research.
- Coulthard, R.M. and Montgomery, M.M. 1981 (eds.) *Studies in discourse analysis*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Crombie, W. 1985. *Discourse and language learning: a relational approach to syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crookes, G. 1986. Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics* 7 pp.57-70.
- _____. 1999. An author responds... *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2) pp.279-285.
- Crookes, G. and Lehner, A. 1998. Aspects of process in an ESL critical pedagogy teacher education course. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2) pp.319-329.
- Cross, G.A. 1993. The interrelation of genre, context, and process in the collaborative writing of two corporate documents. In Spilka, R. (ed.) *Writing in the workplace: new research perspectives*. pp. 141-152. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Devitt, A.J. 1993. Generalizing about genre: new conceptions of an old concept. *College Composition and Communication*. 44.pp. 573-86
- van Dijk, T.A. 1977. *Text and context*. London: Longman.
- _____. 1980. *Macrostructures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- _____. 1985. *Handbook of discourse analysis*. Vol.2. London Academic Press
- _____. 1998a. *Ideology. A multidisciplinary study*. London: Sage.
- _____. 1998b. Towards a theory of context and experience models in discourse processing. In van Oostendorp, H. and Goldman, S. (eds.) *The construction of mental models during reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- _____. 2001. Critical discourse analysis. In Schiffrrin, D., Tannen, D. and Hamilton, H. (eds.) *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Doheny-Farina, S. 1986. Writing in an emerging organization: an ethnographic study. *Written communication*. 3. pp.158-185.
- Dudley-Evans, T. 1986. Genre analysis: an investigation of the introduction and discussion sections of MSc dissertations. In M. Coulthard (ed.) *Talking about text*. Birmingham, UK: English Language Research, University of Birmingham.pp.128-145.
- _____. 1994. Genre analysis: an approach to text analysis for ESP. In M. Coulthard (ed) *Advances in written text analysis*. London and New York: Routledge. pp.219-228.

- Edge, J. 1996. Cross-cultural paradoxes in a profession of values. *TESOL Quarterly*. 30 pp.9-30.
- . 2003. Imperial troopers and servants of the lord: a vision of TESOL for the 21st century. *TESOL Quarterly*. 37. pp. 701-709.
- Een, J. A. 1982. Tense usage in reporting research in geotechnical writing. *Working Papers in ESL*. 2 Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. pp72-91.
- Eggins, S. and Slade, D. 1997. *Analysing casual conversation*. London: Cassell.
- Ewald, J.D. 1999. A plea for published reports on the application of critical pedagogy "Language Study Proper". *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2) pp. 275-279.
- Faigley, L. 1986. Competing theories of process: a critique and a proposal. *College English*. 48:527-42.
- Fairclough, N. 2001. The discourse of New Labour. In Wetherell, S., Taylor, S. and Yates, S.J. (eds.) *Discourse as data*. London: Sage.
- Farrell, T.B. 1991. Practicing the arts of rhetoric: tradition and invention. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. 24. pp.183-212.
- Francis, G. 1986. *Anaphoric nouns*. Discourse analysis monograph 11. English Language Research. University of Birmingham.
- . 1994. Labelling discourse: an aspect of nominal-group lexical cohesion. In Coulthard, M. (ed.) (pp. 83-101)
- Freadman, Anne. 1994. Anyone for tennis? In A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds.) *Genre and the new rhetoric*. (pp.43-66). London: Francis and Taylor.
- Freedman, Aviva. 1994. 'Do as I say': The relationship between teaching and learning new genres. In A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds.) *Genre and the new rhetoric*. (pp.191-210) London: Taylor and Francis.
- Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction ritual: essays on face to face behaviour*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goldstein, L. 2000. A reader reacts... *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(4) pp.739-741.
- Gregory, M. and Carroll, S. 1978. *Language and situation: language varieties and their social contexts*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Grice, P. 1989. *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gross, A. 1990. *The rhetoric of science*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gustafsson, M. 1975. *Some syntactic properties of English law language*. Turku: Department of English, University of Turku.
- Hall, C. 1995. There are myths and there are myths. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1) pp.159-163.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1974. The place of functional sentence perspective in the system of linguistic description. In Danes, F. (ed.) *Papers on functional sentence perspective*. The Hague: Mouton.
- . 1978 *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- . 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

- _____ 1988. On the language of physical science. In M. Ghadessy (ed.) *Registers of written English*. (pp.162-78). London: Pinter.
- _____ 1989. *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ 1994 *An introduction to functional grammar*
London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K., McIntosh, A. and Stevens, P. 1964. *The linguistic sciences and language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. 1998. Ethical test preparation practice: the case of the TOEFL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2) pp.329-337.
- _____ 1999. The author responds... *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2) pp.270-274.
- Hart, R.P. 1986. Of genre, computers and the Reagan inaugural. In H.W. Simons and A.A. Aghazarian (eds.) *Form, genre and the study of political discourse*. University of South Carolina Press.
- Hawkins, M. & Irujo, S. 2004. (Eds.) *Collaborative conversations among language teacher educators*. Alexandria, VA:TESOL Inc.
- Herring, S. 1996. Two variants in electronic message schema. In Herring, S. (Ed.) *Computer-mediated communication: linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives*. Benjamins: Amsterdam and Philadelphia, pp.81-106.
- Herzberg, B. 1986. The politics of discourse communities. Paper presented at the CCC Convention, New Orleans, LA: March.
- Heslot, J. 1982. Tense and other indexical markers in the typology of scientific texts in English. In Hoedt et al. (eds.) *Pragmatics and ESP*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen School of Economics. pp. 83-103.
- Hilder, J. 1997. A reader reacts... *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1) pp.158-162.
- Hinds, J. 1982. Japanese conversational structure. *Lingua*, 57:301-26.
- Hoedt, J. et al. 1982. *Pragmatics and ESP*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen School of Economics.
- Hoey, M. 1983. *On the surface of discourse*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- _____ 1991. Another perspective on coherence and cohesive harmony.
In E. Ventola (ed.), *Functional and systemic linguistics: approaches and uses*. pp.385-414. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter
- _____ 2001. *Textual interaction: an introduction to written discourse analysis*
London: Routledge.
- Holmes, R. 1997. Genre analysis and the social sciences: an investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*. 16 (4) pp.321-338.
- Hopkins, A. and Dudley Evans, T. 1988. A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes*. 7. pp. 113-122.
- Huckin, T.N. 1987. Surprise value in scientific discourse.
Paper presented at the CCC Convention, Atlanta GA, March.
- Hunston, S. 1993. Professional conflict- disagreement in academic discourse.
In M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds.) *Text and technology: in honour of John Sinclair*.

- Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- _____. 2000. Evaluation and the planes of discourse: status and value in persuasive texts. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. (pp.176-207). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hutchins, W.J. 1977. On the problem of 'aboutness' in document analysis. *Journal of Informatics*, 1.1. pp.17-35.
- Hyland, K. 2000. *Disciplinary discourses: social interaction in academic writing*. London: Longman Pearson Education.
- _____. 2002. Activity and evaluation: reporting practices in academic writing. In Flowerdew, J. (ed.), *Academic Discourse* (pp.115-130). London: Longman.
- Hymes, J. 1974. *Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hyon, S. and Chen, R. 2004. Beyond the research article: university faculty genres and EAP graduate preparation. *English for Specific Purposes*. (3). pp.233-263.
- Ibrahim, A.K.M. 1999. Becoming black: rap and hip-hop, race, gender, and identity the politics of ESL learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3) pp. 349-369.
- _____. 2000. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(4) pp.741-744.
- Jacoby, S. 1987. References to other researchers in in literary research articles. *ELR Journal*. 1.33-78.
- Johns, T. 1988. Whence and whither classroom concordancing? In Bongaerts, T. et al.(eds.) *Computer Applications in Language Learning*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- _____. 1991b. From printout to handout: grammar and vocabulary teaching in the the context of data-driven learning. *English Language Research Journal*. Vol. 4. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Johnson, K.E. 1997. The role of theory in L2 teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(4) pp.765-771.
- _____. 1998. The author responds... *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(4) pp.779-782.
- Johnson, K.E. and Golombeck, P.R. 2002. *Teachers' narrative inquiry as professional development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, N. 1998. A defence of using themes and topics to teach ESL/EFL writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), pp.338-342.
- Kanno, Y. 1999. The use of the community-of-practice perspective in language minority research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1), pp.126-131.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. 1981. *The manufacture of knowledge*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kolb, D.A. 1984. *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kristeva, J. 1986. *The Kristeva reader*. (ed.) Moi, T. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kubota, R. 2001. Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1)
- _____. 2002. (Un)raveling racism in a nice field like TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(1) pp.84-92.
- Kuhn, T.S. 1962. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Kumaradivelu, B. 1994. The postmethod conditions: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1) pp.27-48.
- _____. 1995. The author responds... *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1) pp.177-180.
- Lackstrom, J. Selinker, L. and Trimble, L. 1972. Grammar and technical English. *English Teaching Forum*. 10 (5). pp.3-14.
- Latour, B. and Woolgar, S. 1979. *Laboratory life: the social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Liu, D. 1995. "Alternative to" or "Addition to" method? *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1) pp.174-177.
- LoCastro, V. 1994. Learning strategies and learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2) pp.409-414.
- _____. 1995. The author responds... *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1) pp.172-174.
- Lopez, G.S. 1982. Article introductions in Spanish: a study in comparative rhetoric. Unpublished Master's thesis, Aston University, Birmingham.
- Luke, A. 1994. Genres of power: literacy education and the production of capital. In R. Hasan and G. Williams (eds.) *Literacy in Society*. London: Longman.
- Malcolm, L. 1987. What rules govern tense usage in scientific articles. *English for Specific Purposes*. 6. pp.31-44.
- Martin, J.R. 1985. Process and text: two aspects of human semiosis. In Benson, J. D. and Greaves, W.S. (eds.) *Systemic perspectives on discourse*. Vol.1 Norwood, NJ: Ablex. (pp.248-274).
- Martin, J. R. 1993. *A contextual theory of language: the powers of literacy- a genre approach to teaching writing*. (pp.116-36) Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- _____. 2000. Beyond exchange: appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.) *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. (pp.142-175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J.R., Christie, F. and Rothery, J. 1997. Social processes in education: a reply to Sawyer and Watson (and others). In I. Reid(ed.), *The place of genre in learning: current debates* (pp.46-57) Geelong, Victoria: Centre for Studies in Literary Education: Typereader Publications.
- Mauranen, A. 1998. Another look at genre. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 23. Special edition. Festschrift for Kari Sajavaara. pp. 303-15.
- McEnery, T. and Wilson, A. 1996. *Corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Miller, C.R. 1984. Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70:151-67.
- _____. 1994. The cultural basis of genre. In A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds.) *Genre and the new rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Miller, C.R. and Selzer, J. 1985. Special topics of argument in engineering reports. In Odell, L. and Goswami, D. (eds.) *Writing in non-academic settings*. New York: Guilford. pp. 309-341.

- Miller, W.L. and Crabtree, B.F. 1992. Primary care research: a multimethod typology and qualitative roadmap. In Crabtree, B.F. and Miller, W.L. (eds.) *Doing qualitative research: multiple strategies*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Moulton, J. 1983. A paradigm of philosophy: the adversary method. In Harding, S. Hintikka, M.B. (Eds.) *Discovering reality*. Reidel: Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp.149-164.
- Mulkay, G. 1979. *Science and the sociology of knowledge*. London: George Allen Unwin.
- Myers, G. 1989. The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics* 10 (1) 1-35.
- 1990. *Writing biology: texts in the social construction of scientific knowledge*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Nelson, G. 1998. Categorizing, classifying, labeling: a fundamental cognitive process. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4) pp.727-732.
- Nwogu, K.N. 1997. The medical research paper: structure and function . *English for Specific Purposes*. 16 (2) pp.119-138.
- Oliver, R.T. 1971. *Communication and culture in ancient India and China*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
- Ong, W.J. 1981. *Fighting for life: contest, sexuality, and consciousness*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Oster, S. 1981. The use of tenses in reporting past literature. In Selinker, L. Tarone, E. and Hanzeli, V. (eds) *English for academic and technical purposes: studies in honour of Louis Trimble*. Rowley, MA: Newburg House.
- Oxford, R.L. and Green, J.M. 1995. Making sense of learning strategy assessment: towards a higher standard of research accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1) pp.166-171.
- Pare, A. 1993. Discourse regulations and the production of knowledge. In Spilka, R. (ed.) *Writing in the workplace: new research perspectives*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 111-123.
- Pare, A. and Smart, G. 1994. Observing genres in action: towards a research methodology. In Freedman, A. and Medway, P. (eds.) *Genre and the new rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis. pp. 146-154.
- Peacock, M. 2002. Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. *System*. 30(4). pp.479-497.
- Peirce Norton, B. 1995. Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1). pp.10-32.
- Peirce Norton, B. 1996. Interpreting data: the role of theory. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2) pp.337-340.
- Perelman, C. and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. 1969. *The new rhetoric :a treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press.
- Price, S. 1996. A reader reacts... *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2) pp.331-336.
- Reid, J. 1994. Responding to ESL students' texts: the myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly* 28(2) pp.273-292.
- Reid, J. 1995. The author responds... *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1) pp.163-166.
- Richards, K. & Edge, J. 1998. May I see your warrant, please? Justifying

- outcomes in qualitative research. *Applied Linguistics*. 19 /3:334-356.
- Richards, K. 2003. *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. London: Palgrave.
- Rorty, R. 1979. *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rouse, J. 1990. The narrative reconstruction of science. *Inquiry*. 33. pp.179-96.
- Rumelhart, D.E. 1980. Schemata: the building blocks of cognition. In R.J. Spiro, B.C. Bruce, and W.E. Brewer (eds), *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension*. Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Samraj, B. 2002. Introductions in research articles: variations across disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*. 21(1). pp.1-17.
- Sanford, A.J. and S.C. Garrod. 1981. *Understanding written language*. Chichester, U.K.: John Wiley & Sons.
- dos Santos, V.B.M.P. 2002. Genre analysis of business letters of negotiation. *English for Specific Purposes*. 21(2). pp.167-169
- Schlessman, A. 1997. Reflective experience as a foundation for intelligent L2 teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(4) pp.775-779.
- Schryer, Catherine. 1994. The lab.v. the clinic: sites of competing genres. In A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds.) *Genre and the new rhetoric*. (pp.105-124). London: Taylor and Francis.
- Scollon, R. 1994. Cultural aspects of constructing the author. In D. Keller-Cohen (ed.) *Literacy: interdisciplinary conversations*. (pp.213-227). New Jersey: Hampton.
- Searle, J.R. 1969. *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sharkey, J. and Johnson, K.E. 2003. *The 'TESOL Quarterly' dialogues: Rethinking issues of language, culture and power*. TESOL Publications: Alexandria, VA.
- Silva, T. 1997. On the ethical treatment of ESL writers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2). pp.359-363.
- _____. 1998. The author responds.. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), pp.342-352.
- Sinclair, J. M. 1986. Fictional worlds. In Coulthard 1986. pp.43-60.
- Sinclair, J. M. and Coulthard M. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva, T. 1997. On the ethical treatment of ESL writers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2). pp.359-363.
- _____. 1998. The author responds.. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), pp.342-352.
- Smart, G. 1993. Genre as communicative invention: a central banker's response to its executives' expectations as readers. In Spilka, R. (ed.) *Writing in the workplace: new research perspectives*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 124-140.
- Spack, R. 1997. The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(4) pp.765-774.
- _____. 1998a The author responds to Nelson... *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4) pp.732-735.

- _____. 1998b The author responds to Carson... *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4) pp. 740-746.
- Spencer, A. 1975. *Noun-verb combination in law*. Birmingham: LSU, University of Aston in Birmingham.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. 1986. *Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stanley, R.M. 1984. The recognition of a macrostructure: a pilot study. *Reading as a foreign language*. 2. pp.156-168.
- Stubbs, M. 1996. *Text and corpus analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____. 2001. Computer-assisted text and corpus analysis: lexical cohesion and communicative competence. In (eds.) Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. and Hamilton, H. *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swales, J. 1974. *Notes on the function of attributive en-participles in scientific discourse*. Papers for Special University Purposes No.1, ELSU, University of Khatoum.
- _____. 1981. *Aspects of article introductions*. Birmingham, UK: The University of Aston, Language Studies Unit.
- _____. 1985. A genre-based approach to language across the curriculum. Paper presented at the RELC Seminar on Language Across the Curriculum, at SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore, Apr.1985. Published in Tickoo, M.L. (ed.) 1986 in *Language across the curriculum*. Singapore: SEAMEO RELC.
- _____. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Tadros, A. 1981. *Linguistic prediction in economics texts*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Birmingham.
- _____. 1985. *Prediction in text*. Birmingham: English Language Research, University of Birmingham.
- _____. 1994 Predictive categories in expository text. In Coulthard 1994 (ed.) pp. 68-82.
- Tannen, D. 1999. *The argument culture: changing the way we argue and debate*. New York: Virago.
- _____. 2002. Agonism in academic discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34:1651-1669
- Tarone, E., Dwyer, S., Gillette, S. and Icke, V. 1981. On the use of the passive in two astrophysics journal papers. *The ESP Journal*. 1. pp.123-140.
- Thompson, G. and Hunston, S. 2000. Evaluation: an introduction. In S. Hunston and Thompson, G. (eds.) *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp.1-27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, G. and Zhou, J. 2000. Evaluation and organization in text: the structuring role of evaluative disjuncts. In S. Hunston and Thompson, G. (eds.), *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. (pp.121-39) Oxford: Oxford University press
- Toohy, K 1998. Breaking them up, taking them away: ESL students in grade 1.

- TESOL Quarterly*, 32(1) pp.62-85.
- _____. 1999. The author responds... *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1) pp.132-136.
- Trimble, M.T. and Trimble, L. 1982. Rhetorical-grammatical features of scientific and technical texts as a major factor in written ESP communication. In Hoedt et al. (eds) pp. 199-216.
- Van Norstrand, A.D. 1994. A genre map of R&D knowledge production for the U.S. Department of Defense. In Freedman, A. and Medway, P. (eds.) pp.133-145.
- Vergaro, C. 2002. 'Dear Sirs, what would you do if you were in our position? Discourse strategies in Italian and English money-chasing letters. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34(9). pp.1211-1233.
- Wadden, P. and Hilke, R. 1999. Polemics gone astray: a corrective to recent criticisms of TOEFL preparation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2) pp.263-270.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1973. *An applied linguistics approach to discourse analysis*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- _____. 1979. *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2000. On the limitations of linguistics applied. *Applied Linguistics*. 21 (1). pp.3.25.
- Wilson, D. 1994. Relevance and understanding. In Brown, G., Malmkjaer, K. Pollit, A. and Williams, J. (eds.) *Language and understanding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winsor, D. 1989. An engineer's writing and the corporate construction of knowledge. *Written Communication*. 6. pp. 270-285.
- Winter, E.D. 1977. A clause-relational approach to English texts: a study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse. *Instructional Science*, 6.1
- _____. 1979. Replacement as a fundamental function of the sentence in context. *Forum linguisticum*, 4, 2: 95-133.
- _____. 1982. *Towards a contextual grammar of English: the clause and its place in the definition of the sentence*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- _____. 1986. Clause relations as information structure: two basic text structures in English. In Coulthard 1994 (ed.) pp. 88-108.
- _____. 1992. The notion of the unspecific versus the specific as one way of analyzing the information of a fund-raising letter. In Mann, W.C. and Thompson, S.A. (eds.) *Discourse descriptions: diverse analyses of fund-raising text*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Yates, S. 2001. Researching internet interaction: sociolinguistics and corpus analysis. In Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S. (eds.) *Discourse as Data*. London: Sage.
- Young, L. 1994. *Crosstalk and culture in Sino-American communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zappen, J. P. 1983. A rhetoric for research in sciences and technologies. In Anderson, P.V.R., Brockman, R.J. and Miller, C.J. (eds.) *New essays in technical and scientific communication*. Farmingdale NY: Baywood.

Appendix A

Readers' and Authors' Displacement Triads

Readers' Displacement Triads

RR1

Identification: How to respond to student texts and avoid the abuses of appropriation is a good place to begin.....

Non-concessive negation: I do not believe that research has intimidated a significant number of ESL teachers from limiting their responses to student texts.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Leki (1990), for example, mentions the problem of appropriation without noting an overreaction one way or the other. Her advice for dealing with a case of appropriation coincides with Greenhalgh's (1992) and does not suggest that we should be so irresponsible as to completely disengage ourselves from students' texts to allow for some sort of vacuous writing experience.

Belief/practice rebuttal: With that said, I would not dispute Reid's earnest account of coming to terms with the troubling issues associated with appropriation.... But I cannot accept as accurate her analysis of the type of influence process and writer issues have exerted on our discipline. There are myths and then there are myths.

Identification: Appropriation certainly can exist in an expressivist, cognitivist, and eclecticism classroom,

Concessive negation: and Reid has every right to alert us to the dangers as she sees them. But she misses the full extent of where and when appropriation can take hold, for it is even possible in her model.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: for it is even possible in her model. In the hands of a sincere but naïve or overly enthusiastic proponent of contrastive rhetoric, for example, the same sorts of extremes and abuses can happen as with process – and writer-oriented research.

Offering notional clarification: Like any other supporter of an evolving but controversial approach in our profession, an advocate of contrastive rhetoric must avoid its extremes... Intentionally or unintentionally, an advocate who veers too far toward theoretical relativism can convey to students the message that a single hypothesis about writing and the writer can encompass each student's culture, writing behavior, and needs.

RR2

Identification: LoCastro gathered quantitative data (using the SILL) and qualitative data (using group interviews), then contrasted the two kinds of data.

Non-concessive negation: The conclusions she drew from comparing these two kinds of data are unjustified.

Replacement:

Citing notional misunderstanding: Normally people who use the SILL understand the restrictions placed on use and interpretation of this (and any other) summative rating scale. Apparently LoCastro, in comparing her SILL results with findings from group interviews, was quite surprised that the outcomes of these two modes were not the same and on that basis, questioned the validity of the SILL. If one were so inclined, one could just as easily have used the results to question the validity of the group interviews.

Factual counterclaim: In fact, with groups of students from junior high age through adulthood in many countries around the world, the SILL has proven highly valid. Its

predictive and concurrent validity are demonstrated by strong relationships between the SILL on the one hand and language performance on the other. *{List of 16 supporting references follows}*

Identification: LoCastro observes that the SILL includes “no strategies specifically addressing listening as a means to learn” (p.412)

Non-concessive negation: We find this not only puzzling but also misleading and untrue.

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim

There are a number of strategies, such as watching television in the target language or paying attention to what people say, in which listening is an essential component. All the conversation-related strategies in the SILL involve listening. Researchers and teachers have repeatedly used the SILL to obtain information on strategies for listening.

No second part to Replacement.

Identification: She indicates that there is some confusion in her mind about the statement that “most learning strategies can be applied equally well to both ESL and EFL situations”, which she says comes from page 6 of Oxford (1990) and about the fact that the version of the SILL she used was Version 7.0 for ESL/EFL. She says, “No explanation is given for the meaning of the label” (pp.411-412).

Non-concessive negation: This is patently wrong.

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim

Oxford (1990, p.6) spends three full paragraphs (with their own major headings) discussing the differences between second and foreign language settings. The appendix to the same book contains SILL Version 5.1 (for native English speakers learning another language) and Version 7.0 (for nonnative speakers learning English). The differences, along with when to use each version, are fully explained on page 199 in the assessment chapter of the book.

No second part to Replacement

Type 3 negation: There are methodological problems in LoCastro’s study.

REPLACEMENT

Citing imperfect methodology: The sample was very small, compared to the usual hundreds of most studies involving the SILL results. She does not address the issue of where the SILL results might be different with a larger sampling or with a different or more heterogeneous group.

Identification: LoCastro’s SILL results indicated medium or average overall strategy use among her subjects, and medium use of the six categories of strategies as well. She reports this finding

Non-concessive negation: but because she fails

REPLACEMENT

Citing imperfect methodology: to report any other SILL date to compare it to – no students at other levels, and no statement of what she expected to find –

Citing consequence of methodological ‘error’: it is hard say what, if anything, the finding means.

RR3

Identification: As overall principles, strategies cannot take the place of specific methods/procedures/techniques because only through the latter can teachers accomplish their classroom objective. Kumaravadivelu’s argument for replacing methods/procedures seem to be that “none of these methods can be realized in their purist form” (p.29), and none of the methods work for all students at all times.

Concessive negation: Although this may be correct, Kumaravadivelu’s reasoning for substituting methods is, I believe, flawed.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Few things occur in their purest form. The fact that none of the methods work in all situations for all students does not mean that they are useless. On the contrary, these methods are invaluable because good teachers can select the best methods for the specific situation.

Counterclaim support: Total Physical Response (TPR), for example, has proven to be a very effective method for beginning students, children and adults alike. Grammar-Translation often works very well for a homogeneous class of educated adults who need only reading knowledge in the target language. The problems we have are not with the methods but with those who use the methods in the wrong place at the wrong time.

RR4

Identification: However, I wish to raise several questions concerning her theorizing of social identity, whether it actually does overcome the dichotomy she addresses and make consequent comments on agency, power, and practice in the application of post-structural thinking to SLA..

Non-concessive negation: Whether Peirce overcomes dichotomy of language learner/learning context is questionable, as is, consequently, whether she raises the most pertinent and pressing questions that poststructural theory raises for second language acquisition (SLA) theory.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: Borrowing from Weedon, Peirce asserts “the multiple nature of the subject; subjectivity as a site of struggle; and subjectivity as changing” (p.15). Fundamental to her argument is the application of these characteristics to social identity. But this theoretical conflation of subjectivity and identity weakens her own position because it blinds her to the practical distinction she in fact necessarily continues to make.

Offering ‘error’ analysis + Citing article deficiency: I am suggesting then that Peirce’s argument places discourse as a medium through which subject interests may be facilitated or impeded, but that she fails to adequately incorporate into her account how those interests themselves, and the subjects as such, is constructed by discourse. The identity the learner takes up and the resistance offered to alternative positions are presented as depending on meanings maintained individually, rather than socially. The danger here is of reducing (social) language use to (individual) language competence. Consequently, there is no

indication that in challenging the discourse practices themselves, the subject identity and motivating interests are at the same time brought into question.

Identification: Peirce substitutes the term investment for motivation, arguing that it better signals “the socially and historically constructed relationship of the women to the target of language” (p.17). Yet investment does seem to be a function of a dominant and enduring identity (e.g. mother in the case of Martina) rather than of prevailing practices and which, like motivation, seems the dominant factor in determining whether or not the subject will insist on speaking.

Concessive negation: Although Peirce shows the importance of circumstance in shaping the relative ease or difficulty with which the right to speak can be claimed (in contrast to the concept of motivation that she claims provides no space for such variability), not only does her argument rely on the concept of continuing identity (mother in Martina’s case) that resists prevailing practices because it insists on a meaning independent of these practices, but she also grounds investment itself in a noncontingent, ahistorical subject.

REPLACEMENT

Citing unsubstantiated claims: Thus, she argues that “if learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wide range of symbolic and material resources” (p.17). She adds, “learners will expect or hope to have a good return on that investment” and further that “this return on investment must be seen as commensurate with the effort expended on learning the second language” (p.17). There is no suggestion this a priori calculative rationality directing investment changes across cultures and over time. That is, it is not constructed in discourse but is an inherent quality of all human subjects. This is a very contentious claim and yet central to Peirce’s argument. The assumption of such a given, rational subject has been a central object of criticism by much poststructural and critical thinking alike.

Offering claim weakness analysis: I am suggesting that on the one hand Peirce resorts to a pre-given subject-agent, yet on the other argues that “subjectivity is produced in a variety of social sites, all of which are structured by relations of power” (p.15). The place of the subject-agent needs further clarification, especially if the dissolution of agency into social/discourse determinism is to be avoided.

Peirce deals with agency simply by asserting “the subject has human agency” and that consequently “the subject positions a subject takes up within a particular discourse are open to argument” (p.15) by the subject. However, whether the subject who resists does so according to interests and faculties that are discourse mediated or pre-given remains very unclear.

RR6

Identification: It is more productive for us to think about teacher education as deliberate social experience. Johnson gives credence to “teaching as a socially constructed activity that requires the interpretation and negotiations of meanings embedded within classrooms and schools where teachers teach” (p.767). She wants us to focus on a process of making sense of teachers’ experience and on how to structure teacher education programs so that they foster this sense-making.

Concessive negation: Her suggestions to use case-based methods, professional development schools, and portfolio assessment are legitimate. She does not, however,...

REPLACEMENT

Citing article deficiency: ...establish the thinking strategies and procedures that are necessary to empower L2 teachers-in-training to become reflective and critical thinkers.

Offering article ‘correction’: Ours students must be involved in higher level thinking if we are serious about wanting L2 teachers to be reflective practitioners.

If we expect teachers to be reflective practitioners and if we want prospective teachers to make sense of what they do in terms of the goals of teacher education programs, we need to teach higher level thinking that includes the ability to identify criteria, measure complex behaviors by establishing multiple and competing criteria, match measurements to appropriate criteria by categories, and evaluate performance with these multiple criteria in relation to the diverse goals of education. Then we could have the authentic assessment of teachers’ abilities that Johnson writes about.

Type 3 negation: Teachers’ sense-making risks being anti-intelligent if it is reduced to the study of case after case alone in the belief that students will somehow understand their experiences.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: If we expect teachers to be reflective practitioners and if we want prospective teachers to make sense of what they do in terms of the goals of teacher education programs, we need to teach higher level thinking

Counterclaim support: that includes the ability to identify criteria, measure complex behaviors by establishing multiple and competing criteria, match measurements to appropriate criteria by categories, and evaluate performance with these multiple criteria in relation to the diverse goals of education. Then we could have the authentic assessment of teachers’ abilities that Johnson writes about.

RR8

Identification: The process of classifying, categorizing, or labeling is cognitive. It is what our brain does.

Non-concessive negation: We cannot not classify!

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: Spack, therefore, has based her argument on a false assumption. She is assuming that we can choose to classify or not.

Clarification by counterclaim: We have no choice. Our brains classify.

Type 3 negation: Another difficulty with Spack’s argument is that she has set up a false dichotomy – that our choice, as ESL/EFL teachers and researchers, is to view students either as members of cultural groups or as individuals.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Students (and other human beings) are both members of groups and individuals, not one or the other.

Counterclaim support: The goal, then, in interacting with members of other cultures is to move from knowing a person as a member of a culture to knowing the persona as an individual. However, as individuals, humans are still members of cultures. To illustrate the impact of culture on the individual, Gudykunst and Kim (1984) modified Miller and

Steinberg's (1975) model, changing the names of the levels of psychocultural, sociocultural, and cultural. In so doing, they emphasized that even at a psychological (i.e., individual, personal, idiosyncratic) level of interaction, all parties are members of a culture. Humans cannot be cultureless or culture free.

RR9

Identification: For Spack, labeling students by cultural group – Chinese or Russian, for example – is problematic because by doing so, teachers are setting themselves up to perpetuate myths about these cultures.

Concessive negation: I agree with Spack that teachers must understand students' strengths, but I disagree with her implied position that knowing more about students' cultural backgrounds works against that understanding.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: I would argue that that teachers who find themselves 'falling into the trap of developing and perpetuating stereotypes – and ultimately of underestimating students' knowledge and their writing skill' (p.767) are teachers who most likely fail to understand what these students bring to the learning environment. Rather, teachers need to recognize ways in which students are likely to differ from the teachers' necessarily restricted understanding of learners' backgrounds so that they can both appreciate and draw on the students' knowledge and skills.

Counterclaim support: Applied linguistics is a relatively new discipline, and there is still much to learn about the complex interactions that shape any learner's acquisition of an L2. Myths have no place in our developing picture of language learners and of language learning, and we as L2 instructors must continue to ask relevant questions and explore possible answers to these questions...Not to question how this background might affect language acquisition is to deny an essential aspect of these learners' experience and will ultimately lead to an incomplete and inaccurate description of their language learning.

RR 10

Identification: But so far the field lacks a framework for discussing these issues as an integral part of language minority students' language acquisition. The community-of-practice perspective may indeed prove to be such a framework. One of Toohey's contributions is to introduce this framework to the field of language minority research, demonstrating that it can illuminate those aspects of student experience that L2 educators knew were relevant but with which they did not know what to do.

Concessive negation: Thus, although I recognize the advantages of adopting the community-of-practice perspective for language minority research, I have strong reservations about using the notion of LPP to describe the experiences of language minority students in the school community.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: ..the situation of language minority students *{in schools}* seems to me to be considerably different from those highly specialized worlds in which apprenticeship is the standard mode of learning. It is true that some language minority students eventually acquire enough of the L2 and go on to participate more fully in the school community. But many others are probably permanently relegated to the margins, never allowed a chance to become full participants.

Offering 'error' analysis: School not only systematically blocks participants but simultaneously sends the message to language minority students that they are not allowed in because they are not worthy enough. Studies by McKay and Wong (1996) and by Harklau (1994) both point out that ESL is generally "stigmatized and remedial" (Harklau (p.259) and regarded as a "dummy program" (McKay and Wong, p.586). To the extent that identity

is socially constructed (Mead, 1934; Peirce, 1995; Taylor, 1992), it is difficult for a person who is treated as a second-rate citizen to sustain self-esteem.

RR11

Type 3 negation: Smitherman apparently did not investigate conditions in Oakland, as demonstrated by her use of a statistical inaccuracy to bolster her premise...Specifically, Smitherman states that “71% of Oakland’s Black students are tracked in special education or learning disabilities-type programs” (p.140c

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: Unfortunately, although one cannot isolate from these data the number of African American students whose special education classifications are based solely on or even primarily on perceived language deficiencies, it is safe to say that not all of these students are so classified because of language issues. Regardless, the percentage of African American students tracked in special education programs is far less than the 71% cited by Smitherman.

Counterclaim support: . By no means do I intend to criticize Smitherman’s conclusions that educators need to account for their students’ language differences both in setting educational policy and in creating and implementing effective classroom teaching methods. Nor do I disagree with her contention that the educational needs of African American students in urban schools are not always well served. However, by using inaccurate statistical analysis to support her points, Smitherman detracts from their forcefulness and provides a convenient basis for those who disagree with her conclusions to simply dismiss them. Particularly when accurate information is both in the public domain and easily obtainable, it is inexcusable to misstate the facts.

RR12

Identification: In claiming that the TOEFL and TOEFL preparation materials are based on discrete chunks of language rules and frequently without co-text or context, perhaps Hamp-Lyons mainly has in mind the Structure and Written Expression section of the exam (the shortest of the three sections).

Concessive negation: Here, her charge contains its largest grain of truth, and it is this section of the exam that is most in need of revision.. Yet even if one arbitrarily limits Hamp-Lyons’ critique to this section, she appears to overextrapolate from the TOEFL preparation texts she perused and sharply oversteps the facts when she surmises that the only strategy for deciding what language areas to focus on would seem to be to work out the probable frequency of different types of items or probes across multiple, actual TOEFL forms. But even this strategy leaves the teacher with nothing more than a laundry list of grammatical or lexical points to be covered. (p.334)

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Many preparation texts indeed inadequately treat this decontextualized section of the exam, but this does not mean that the test presents a mere “laundry list” of grammatical and lexical mistakes. Even this most dubious subtest of the TOEFL focuses largely on commonly occurring language errors that significantly impede fluency and accuracy (e.g.. incomplete sentences, pronoun errors, subject-verb agreement) that are distracting (if not unacceptable) to many academic readers, particularly the North American professors who will read and grade the students’ future written work.

Counterclaim support: Although L1 compositionists have long abandoned error correction as their principal focus, cutting-edge contemporary writing teachers nevertheless include in their pedagogical brief a commitment to cultivating students’ awareness of the

widely subscribed to (and admittedly politicized) conventions of written English, if sometimes only for the pragmatic reason that less enlightened faculty (and administrators) elsewhere in the university will not tolerate what they view as work riddled with repeated and egregious violations of grammar and usage.

RR13

Identification: Crookes and Lehner point out that “critical pedagogy should be seen as a social and educational process rather than just as a pedagogical method” (p.327).

Concessive negation:

In developing applications of critical pedagogy to language classrooms, supporting teacher education that is based on a critical pedagogical orientation, as demonstrated by Crookes and Lehner, is a practical beginning and an appropriate research step, but it is not sufficient.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: The joint goals of critical pedagogy, the “simultaneous development of English communicative abilities and the ability to apply them to developing a critical awareness and the ability to act on it to improve matters” (p.320), are not what administrators perceive as the mission of most S/FL programs.

Offering notional clarification: Administrators may expect teachers to adopt a communicative approach through the exclusive use of the target language, so-called authentic materials, and so-called meaningful interaction with the goal of developing nativelike competency in the S/FL. The expectations may frustrate the teacher who is equally interested in engaging in a problem-posing pedagogy and providing opportunities for learners to participate in problem-posing activities conducted in the target language when appropriate.

Identification: Like others, I am interested in critical pedagogy and strongly desire to see a critical pedagogical orientation promoted within higher education and specifically in language teaching and learning.

Non-concessive negation: I find it disheartening, however, to be frequently reminded of the importance and even necessity of such an orientation without being exposed to even a minimal idea of how to address the concerns that teachers face everyday.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: The brief phrase “subject to administrative constraints” (p.323) does not refer to a minor issue.

Citing article deficiency: Furthermore, because language instruction in its very essence is content free and differs in nature from concepts discussed in contexts such as teacher education, Crookes and Lehner’s report does not show how critical pedagogy in content courses informs teachers about its use in classrooms where students need to learn nouns, verbs, and adjectives.

RR14

Type 3 negation: One problem with the article was the confusion it maintained between testing and assessment.

REPLACEMENT

Citing article deficiency: The authors state in the abstract that the purpose of the article is “to help teachers decide what types of language tests to use” (p.653) but then continue to talk about various kinds of “assessments”. The same confusion occurs at the top of page 658. In fact, the term *assessments* is very confusing and one is left wondering if the authors are evaluating different assessments, assessment task, tests, or assessment systems.

Offering article ‘correction’: Some readers might consider language assessment to refer ultimately to grading, and assessed activities can include tests, exams, and other activities not completed under controlled conditions. For this reason, Huerta-Macias (1995) refers to alternative assessments as “an alternative to standardized testing” (p.8). Rather than drawing a clear distinction between assessment and testing, Brown and Hudson appear to believe that the alternatives to tests and typical testing tasks can be added to existing assessment practices in a quantitative manner. In ESOL, testing usually refers to both informal tests and more formal exams.

I understand a test as a performance activity or battery of performance activities of limited duration completed under controlled, supervised conditions by students who are graded individually by instructors. Exams are similar, but they tend to be more formal, are usually taken at terminal points of expected learning, and are graded by examiners. National and international exams are even more formal and are supervised externally, usually with rigorous reliability monitoring.

Type 3 negation: Beyond the lack of clarity in the distinction between tests and assessments, a second confusion results from a haphazard coverage of the categories of tests/assessments.

REPLACEMENT

Citing article deficiency: For example, the section called Personal-Response Assessments has Conferences as its first subsection (p.662). I believe that what is being assessed is not the conferences but the outcome of conferences in free-writing tasks, which also appear in the preceding section under the heading of Performance Assessments (p.662) Perhaps even more unfortunately, they fail to perceive a central issue:

Offering article ‘correction’: Assessing activities and tasks that encourage initiative and diversity probably requires different criteria for assessment than those that are communal and convergent. These alternative activities not only permit a more global perspective of students’ ability but also reflect diversity.

RR15

Type 3 negation: First, his description of my work contains two factual inaccuracies.

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: He states, “For instance, Goldstein (1987) focuses on the linguistic features of Black English as found in the speech of Puerto Rican youths in New York City” (p.352). In fact, I described the learners as follows:” William, 16 years old, and Paternoster, 18, were both students in the same high school in the New York City metropolitan area. William had lived in Jersey City for 5 years, Paternoster for 3. Both were born in Ecuador, and both spoke Spanish as their first language” (Goldstein, 1987,p.148). In fact, my subjects were not Puerto Rican (elsewhere in my article I referenced my subjects as Hispanic and speakers of Spanish), and they were not all from New York City. Some, as I wrote in the above quotation and elsewhere, were from Jersey City, New Jersey.

Type 3 negation:

Of even greater concern is Ibrahim's mischaracterization of my research questions and results.

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: He states:

..For instance, Goldstein (1987) focuses on the linguistic features of Black English as found in the speech of Puerto Rican youths in New York City. *However, she does not address the issue of what it means for Puerto Rican youths to learn Black English [italics added].....*Instead Goldstein offers a very meticulous syntactico-morphological analysis. (p.352)

What I did goes far beyond 'a very meticulous syntactico-morphological analysis'(p.352) and, contrary to the author's claims about what I did not do, my article directly addressed the question of the role of identification in what individuals learn: *{instances}*

I addressed and discussed the role of identification in my subjects' acquisition of Black English versus standard English in many other places within the article.

Authors' Displacement Triads

ARI

Identification: {Hall writes} that I overstate the ability of research to intimidate ESL teachers.

..I confess that I am a worrier. Indeed my tendency is to take what I read too seriously, always to be concerned with improving my teaching (and my students' learning), and at least initially to be intimidated by the proclamations of others.

Non-concessive negation: However, I believe Hall may understate the importance of the appropriation issue in the writing classroom.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Despite the fact that the discussion of the issue has all but disappeared from the research literature, I still see the question of response to and possible appropriation of student text as central to the whole enterprise of teaching writing.

Counterclaim support: The tension between appropriation and intervention appears whenever a teachers responds to a student paper; how to achieve that precarious balance between teaching and simply turning a student back into the writing process, between guidance that helps students to avoid serious problems and allowing students to learn from their own experiences, between intervening directly and providing opportunities for students to revise independently...I continue to struggle with this issue, and I think that many teachers also to balance 'teacherly' instruction with student learning. Thus, I believe that although the research discussion on appropriation of student text is no longer visible, the issue is at the heart of teaching writing and continues to be viable, even essential, for teachers to consider.

Identification: {Hall writes} that I believe the expressivists are wholly responsible for all appropriation of student text

Concessive negation: Second, it is true that I used what I knew might be a controversial example of appropriation when I discussed the single, end-of-semester portfolio grade. But I do not consider myself an antiexpressivist.

REPLACEMENT

Approach justification: However, most researchers and teachers who have previously discussed appropriation have used product-based approaches and examples...So I decided to use a process-based approach to make my point: that appropriation was not the sole purview of nonexpressivist methods.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: And, to be honest, experience has demonstrated that the more time I spend with student drafts, the less time students spend on them: that is, once students see how interested I am in making suggestions to improve their drafts, they do their best to transfer all responsibility to me...As a result I have rearranged the process of intervention in my writing class. I depend more on multiple audiences (e.g. peers, writing center specialists, and writing tutorials) to assist students on rough drafts.... By the end of the semester, I hope, students have enough distance from their papers, more resources and coping strategies, and, most important, more information about being writers, that they can use resources and their own writing experiences to make meaningful and substantial changes on these essays.

Identification: {Hall writes} that I am bent upon resurrecting and continuing the process/product split.

Negation: Not performed

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: ...I am committed, in this article as well as in other writing I have published, to demonstrating that process and product exist along a continuum and that a concentration on either can make learning to write more difficult for students.

Counterclaim support: The false dichotomy between the two that I define in my article has not only been written to death but has had a negative effect on ESL writing research.

AR2

Identification: Some of Oxford and Green's comments reflect different assumptions about the merits of different research styles.

Negation: Not performed

REPLACEMENT

Approach justification: Ethnographic research data collection and analysis techniques document patterns of values, attitudes, and/or behavior across a particular sociocultural community. Use of these techniques ensures both the validity (credibility) and reliability (dependability) of the study. Rather than assume generalization across social and cultural settings, ethnographic research reports allow for readers to determine possible transfer of findings to other situations.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: Thus, what I have found through ethnographic means provides equally valid evidence which, together with the SILL results, may help us to better understand what learners in a different learning environment from that of North America do.

Identification: With regard to the second issue, Oxford and Green claim the SILL Version 7.0 is valid for both ESL and EFL settings.

Concessive negation: I have no quarrel with the distinctions which are offered; however, I do not agree with statements in Oxford (1990) such as the following: "these differences *occasionally* (my emphasis) have implications for language learning strategies" and "most learning strategies can be applied *equally* (my emphasis) well to both situations" (p.6)

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: The fact that the versions have been used with learners of many different languages does not necessarily mean the classification of the learning strategies nor the different kinds of learning strategies on the inventory are the most appropriate for assessing what learners do to learn languages with the L1 and sociocultural backgrounds cited by Oxford.

Counterclaim support: Given the ongoing debate about the relationship of language, thought, and culture, unlike Oxford, I am reluctant to claim that what learners do in one learning environment to learn is the same as or very similar to what learners do in other environments. There may be cognitive processing universals; however, as sociocultural practices pervade so many other areas of life, it is difficult to argue that they are absent with regard to learning strategies and processes.

Identification: Thirdly, I would like to react to the comment about my not having read any of the recent literature on the subject of learning strategies, specifically related to the use of Oxford's strategy inventory.

Negation: Not performed

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: Oxford attaches to her five-page response a reference list with 18 entries, 12 of which are unpublished master's these or doctoral dissertations, papers read at conferences, published in a journal unavailable in Japan or marked "in press." It is simply not possible for overseas researchers to have access to such materials.

AR3

Identification: Liu strongly believes that my claim about the demise of method is premature.

Negation: Not performed

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: Any perceptive reader of recent scholarly literature in TESOL would have noticed a new and fast emerging perspective that aims to propel L2 pedagogy beyond the limited and limiting boundaries of the traditional concept of method.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: It seems to me that, for reasons discussed in my article, the search for method has reached a dead end. I do not anticipate any new method with an entirely new set of principles and procedures emerging any time soon.

Identification: The second concern of Liu's is that my strategic framework is only an addition, not an alternative, to method.

Negation: Not performed

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: He has interpreted my work exclusively in classical methodological terms, whereas the very purpose of my article is to show that there are alternative ways of approaching L2 teaching.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: Unlike traditional methods, the strategic framework is theory natural, that is, not constrained by any one specific theory of language, learning or teaching... My article presents a case for restructuring teacher education so that prospective/practicing teachers can be provided with the knowledge, skill, and autonomy necessary to generate their own location-specific, classroom-oriented innovative macro/microstrategies.

AR6

Identification: In her response, Amy Schlessman denies that there is a distinction between theory and practice, arguing instead that we as L2 teacher educators should "dissolve this issue of separation of ideas and things" and "stop separating theory and practice."

Concessive negation: In regard to Schlessman's position I posit that one can say theory and practice are the same, even remove the terms from one's vocabulary, but in reality they are not the same and certainly do not count as the same in life.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Not only is theory prized over practice, but those who construct theory are generally held in higher esteem than and hold positions of power over those who conduct practice.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: This situation is not the result of “artificial distinctions” or “problematic dualisms”; it is reality, and as such the inequalities between theory and practice continue to exact a hefty payment from those who conduct practice.

Identification: Whereas Schlessman warns that teachers’ sense-making “risks being anti-intelligent,”

Negation: Not performed

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: I believe teachers’ sense-making is enormously powerful in transforming their understandings of why they teach the way they do and in empowering them to change their practices as they see fit.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: If we as L2 teacher educators continue to deny the inequalities that exist between theory and practice, we will continue to devalue the ways in which teachers make sense of what they know and do.

AR8

Identification: Gayle Nelson believes that the word *labeling* in and of itself has a negative connotation, and so she contends that I stack the deck as I warn that using labels “can lead us to stigmatize, to generalize, and to make inaccurate predictions about what students are likely to do as a result their language or cultural background” (p.765).

Non-concessive negation: Nelson’s search for a more neutral term than *labeling* is not likely to suppress the tendency to generalize and stigmatize that many of us are struggling to overcome.

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: Nelson trivializes the issue, I believe, when she provides a hypothetical example of her experience at a faculty reception, where she cannot tell if someone is “an enemy, a food source, or type of transportation” unless that person satisfies her culturally determined expectation with an “appropriate” response. Nelson’s view of communication assumes a homogeneous and unified social world. As Pratt (1991) points out, such a view takes for granted that interactions between people can be determined by a shared set of norms or rules and ignores the social differences that underlie relationships.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: Nelson maintains that TESOL scholars “stress the equality of cultures” but I think it is important to acknowledge that this worthy principle does not always hold in the face of real-life experience. Whoever is in authority determines what constitutes the norm in any situation. Furthermore, the tendency to make predictions about people’s behavior based on their membership in a particular group has led to unspeakable tragedies, not to mere social infelicities.

Identification: Nelson expresses confusion with my statement that when culture is conflated with difference, there is a tendency to identify U.S. culture as the norm from which students are deviating.

Negation: Not performed

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: Yet that is what Nelson is doing in her study of peer group response groups in an ESL composition class (Carson & Nelson, 1996).

Offering 'error' analysis + Offering notional clarification: Nelson establishes a U.S. norm of pedagogical practices, declaring that they are "geared to developing and maintaining individualism" (p.1) whereas the collectivist goal in Chinese culture is to maintain "group harmony" (p.2). Then she measures three Chinese students' behavior against the U.S. norm. Without acknowledging the phenomenon of the self-fulfilling prophecy (see Biggs & Watson), Nelson claims that the three Chinese students' reluctance to criticize their partners' work is tied to the cultural tradition of seeking group cohesion.... Even though Nelson attempts to account for this behavior by explaining that Chinese students may be "hostile" when interacting with people outside of their primary groups, I would argue that the differences Nelson discovers among Chinese students support my contention that using culture as the only lens through which to evaluate students' classroom behavior is hazardous and misleading. Nelson loses sight of the fact that L1 students, too, irrespective of culture, may exhibit behaviors in peer response groups other than those that the teacher desires (e.g. George, 1984). Because she focuses on cultural difference, Nelson's research has the "distancing and exoticizing effect" that results from the "suppression of similarity" (Leki, 1997, p.242).

Identification: Nelson asks, "Is Spack proposing that ESL/EFL teachers and researchers remain ignorant of their students' cultures?"

Non-concessive negation: The answer is an obvious and emphatic "no."

REPLACEMENT

Belief/practice particularizing: I am not denying the existence of cultural differences. But I am saying that L2 educators need to be careful about who determines what the difference is, how that difference is determined, and especially how we apply knowledge of that difference.

Belief/practice rebuttal: I therefore cannot accept the generalized cultural profile of Chinese students that Nelson assumes in her own research. I disagree with Nelson that getting to know students on an individual level is "an impossible place to begin." I think it is a good place to start.

AR12

Identification: First, Wadden and Hilke direct considerable attention to my characterization of the TOEFL as not reflecting a model of language in use;

Non-concessive negation: however, they misinterpret my use of the term *model*.

REPLACEMENT

Terminological clarification: I use the term not to refer to examples of good language (as in a *model* text) but to refer to an empirically derived, theory-based construct that explains how the English language works – a model in the scientific sense;..

Clarification support: for example, Canale and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence or Bachman's (1990) model of communicative language ability. I note that in their work toward TOEFL 2000, ETS researchers and advisers are putting considerable emphasis on developing a test that will enact a viable model of language in use.

Identification: Wadden and Hilke accuse me of being "patronizing" and of assuming that (adult) learners are not capable of self-guided learning.

Negation: Not performed

REPLACEMENT

Factual counterclaim: My comments were based not on an assumption but on research

Counterclaim support: (including good empirical studies being carried out by my own doctoral students into the effectiveness of self-access learning) supporting the value of having a professional language teacher to support learning in classrooms and in self-access contexts.

Type 3 negation: I cannot accept Wadden and Hilke's argument that the burden of proof rests not with the developers and profit makers but with "independent-minded academic researchers."

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: Where would these researchers get the money to carry out the research? Why should public money be spent on this (even assuming the money was available) when the authors and publishers are making such large profits?

Belief/practice reaffirmation: I suggested that TESOL as the field's professional organization, and as one committed to protecting the interests of language learners everywhere, should set standards for the test preparation industry, partly because of the economic truth that only a large professional body can afford to do so and partly because accreditation by TESOL, should a test preparation text achieve it, would be a strong (and marketable) affirmation of quality.

AR13

Identification: I am sympathetic to Ewald's point that our account offered few suggestions concerning what to do in "classrooms in which students need to learn nouns, verbs and adjectives."

Non-concessive-negation: though one of the few points on which I would disagree with her is in her statement that language instruction "in its very essence is content free."

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim: The last point has been chewed over by many in the TESOL field who have no particular connection to critical and alternative pedagogies. My interpretation of the ideas of these authorities (e.g. Crook, 1983; Ellis, 1993; Snow, 1991) would lead me to say that a language lesson is always about something.

Belief/practice reaffirmation: I would assert that learning goals that refer to the structure of language could be starting point for a dialogical approach to learning that makes the learners active investigators of and actors on their own (linguistic) worlds.

AR14

Type 3 negation: With regard to Bruton's first point, we disagree that our article is confused about the distinction between testing and assessment. We simply do not find it useful to draw an artificial distinction between tests and assessments.

REPLACEMENT

Ideational counterclaim; As we explained, we see various forms of assessments falling along a continuum from discrete-point tests to more open-ended performance assessments.

Counterclaim support: Attempting to draw too strict a distinction between tests and assessments can lead to confusion in evaluating different types of assessments.

Furthermore, in our view, it is up to the teachers who know the students and curriculum in a particular situation to determine which of the many options on this continuum are most appropriate for their particular context.

Type 3 Negation: Bruton's second lament is that rather than drawing a clear distinction between testing and assessment, we feel that "alternatives to tests and typical testing tasks can be added to existing assessment practices in a quantitative manner."

REPLACEMENT

Citing notional misunderstanding: He, on the other hand, quotes Huerta-Macias (1995) indicating that alternative assessments are "an alternative to standardized testing" (p.8). He thereby limits his definition of alternative assessments to a contrast with "standardized testing." He clearly did not understand that we view what he insists on calling *alternative assessments* not as contrasts to standardized tests but rather as new, potentially useful alternatives in assessments that can be used for either standardized or classroom purposes.

Reaction rejection: As for his distinctions among exams, tests, and assessments (not consistent with anything we have ever seen in the literature), we clearly indicated that tests are a subset of assessments and that both can be used in classrooms, in language programs, at the national level, and so forth. Hence, we do not understand his objection.

Type 3 Negation: Bruton's third complaint appears to be that we have included various assessment tasks in multiple categories of our framework, such as including writing tasks under personal-response and performance assessments. Likewise, he appears to assume that all assessment will result in a grade, as his reference to Genesee and Upshur (1996) implies.

REPLACEMENT

Belief/practice particularizing: For us, both of these issues are related to the type of decision that will result from the assessment. For example, writing samples may be evaluated as writing tasks in and of themselves for a grade, used for guidance purposes within a conference, or included as one of the steps in a portfolio process.

Reaction rejection: Bruton's confusion between our assessment and grading does not apply to our article because we are not focusing on the issue of grading, which in any case is only one use for assessments.

Identification: Bruton asserts that we take a testing-based rather than a classroom-based approach to assessment.

Non-concessive negation: Given that our article addresses curriculum implications, washback, feedback, and teacher alternatives, we do not understand how he can make this inference.

REPLACEMENT

Citing goal misunderstanding: His comments on the need to address class size, assessment of different language abilities, teachers' resources, identification of objectives in schools, clarification of "overall assessment systems", variable criteria for different tasks, and relative weighting of the assessment and his concern with the "dilemmas schoolteachers face in assessing students" indicate to us that he wants an entirely different article from the one we wrote – an article that he should perhaps write.

Reaction rejection: If he were to do so, he might come to understand the scope of the issues that he raised and the impossibility of covering them all in one article.

Appendix B

Atkinson/Kubota ICE text



Aston University

Illustration removed for copyright restrictions

Page removed for copyright restrictions.

Appendix C
Contact document to Readers and Authors

TESOL Quarterly . “The Forum” 1996-2000

You will remember that during the above period you contributed to an exchange in the “Forum” section of TESOL Quarterly. For my doctoral thesis under the supervision of Julian Edge at Aston University, Birmingham, UK, I am examining 30 “Forum” texts with a view to establishing whether they are genre driven or not. Your text is one of the 30 to be explored and I should be most grateful indeed if you could take time off from a busy schedule to answer in whatever way you like the questions below.

I emphasize that your comments will be treated in confidence and if quoted verbatim will be done so anonymously.

May I thank you in advance for any contribution you may wish to make. Your response will play a vital role in the analysis of these intertextual critical exchanges which I am examining for potential generic moves and steps. Rather than leave this exploration as a wholly textual interpretation, I am anxious to enrich that analysis by incorporating the views of the participants themselves on the discourse process which they undertook.

I very much look forward to hearing from you.

Cordially,

Christopher Nicol

1. What motivated you to write? Would you care to elaborate on your feelings at the time?
2. To what extent did your text arise naturally from your personal reaction/response to the trigger text? Or was it a conscious product of what you felt the genre demanded?
3. Communicative purpose is taken by many commentators to be a key characteristic of any text laying claim to genre status. Can you briefly say what you felt your own communicative purpose(s) was here?
4. How did you feel about the exchange itself when it was published? How do you feel now?