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Outline

- EAP ➔ genre/EAP approach  (Wingate & Tribble 2012)
- Academic literacies
- Combining the two approaches
- Discipline-specific embedded instruction - An exemplar of genre innovation
- Embedding practices & models
- Institutional context
- Unit Specific Model ➔ Unit Support Program (USP)
- Research question: What is the impact of embedding academic literacies on student engagement, retention, success, performance and learning in the discipline?
English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

- EAP focuses on specific, purposeful uses of language

- Genre/EAP:
  - genre and social constructivist theory
  - restricted to non native speakers of English

- EAP programmes - communicative context and linguistic behaviour developed to meet learners’ needs (Tribble, 2009)

- “Identification of the specific language features, discourse practices and communicative skills of target groups, and on teaching practices that recognise the particular subject-matter needs and expertise of learners,” (Hyland, 2002, p. 385)

- “EAP has nothing to do with topping up generic language skills, but about developing new kinds of literacy. The most effective…EAP courses are likely to be those which seek to equip students with the communicative skills to participate in particular academic cultures,” (Hyland, 2017, p. 21).
What is genre?

- “Social context is predictive of text” (Halliday 1978, p. 189)

- Genres are “multiform, dialogical and situated” (Markinovich et al, 2016)

- Social action determines choice at level of register, lexis, grammar and phonology, and is related to text types and context.

- “A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognised by the expert members of the parent discourse community and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the genre and influences and constrains choice of content and style” (Swales 1990, p. 58)
Genres are not static

- Traditional views of genre –
  - Similarity between language use across disciplines (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987)
  - English language skills generic and transferable across disciplines (Hyland, 2006)

- Genre is not static and homogenous. It changes all the time

- Language is not a fixed and autonomous code but subject to interlocutors in particular contexts, (Halliday, 1973).

- Criticism in teaching disciplinary discourse as static, (Lea & Street, 2000)
Genre and specificity

• Rhetorical choices vary across disciplines due to different epistemological and social practices (Anderson, Evans, & Harshorn, 2014; Swales, 2004)

• Discipline own professional discourse – challenging working outside the discipline (Hyland, 2006)

• “[S]cholarly discourse is not uniform and monolithic but an outcome of different practices and strategies…about what is worth communicating and how this should be done” (Hyland, 2017, p. 21)
Proficiency in disciplinary literacies

- Genuine immersion and interaction to become participant member of discourse community (Norton, 2003)

- English language use of expert members

- “an understanding of the disciplines’ epistemology…the sociocultural context [and] conventions and norms that regulate these interactions” (Wingate, 2015, p. 13)

- Interaction between experts and novices

- Learning the specificity of disciplines in EAP instruction (Hyland, 2006)
Academic Literacies Model

- Needs of all students

- Reading and writing practices as socially situated practices, especially, with a focus on the power relations that are shaped within those practices (Lea & Street, 1998, 2000, 2006)
  - Study skills - cognitive-linguistic skills, transfer to other contexts
  - Academic socialisation - acculturation, use the genres and discourses of their discipline
  - Academic literacies - incorporates academic socialization and, as a situated literacy process, demands particular learning strategies that are not usually acquired naturally, but must be taught.

- Academic literacies model incorporates study skills and academic socialisation approaches
Discipline-specific, embedded instruction

• Genre/EAP and Academic Literacies share much common ground:
  • oriented toward text;
  • discipline and context-specific, and
  • raise students’ awareness of discipline’s communicative and social practices (Wingate & Tribble, 2012)

• Collaboration between EAP experts and subject lecturers:
  • EAP instructors teach academic literacy on the basis of subject-specific texts and materials received from subject lecturers
  • EAP instructors and subject lecturers plan activities together
  • EAP instructors and subject lecturers team teach together
  • Subject lecturer teaches writing
Aim of project

- Genre/EAP and Academic Literacies approaches are complementary
- The future of teaching academic genres lies in an interdisciplinary teaching and learning context with an exemplar of a model of *genre innovation*
- Impact of embedding academic language and literacy instruction into various disciplines across first, second and third years of an undergraduate degree program.
- Role for EAP/ ESP practitioners in teaching disciplinary literacies in tertiary settings in the following areas:
  - embedding academic literacies support within disciplinary teaching contexts;
  - new collaborations forged;
  - collaborative practice in designing teaching, learning, and assessment
A case for the embedded approach

• “the explicit instruction, practice and assessment of [academic language and literacies] into the curriculum of [the student’s] degree” (Chanock 2012, p. 1)

• Multiple benefits of embedding:
  • student success in terms of higher pass rates and grade improvements (Baik & Greig, 2009; Kennelly et al, 2010; Maldoni & Lear, 2016; Mort & Drury 2012; Song, 2006; Thies, 2012)
  • increase in student engagement in terms of improved participation in units (Beatty et 2014; Kift & Moody 2009)
  • improvements in English language proficiency (Davies & Maldoni, 2004; Maldoni et al, 2009)
  • enhancement in student learning (Brooman-Jones et al 2011; Maldoni, 2017)

• Embedded models are more effective in faculty-based programs (Barthel, 2013)
Models of embedding

Adjunct
Generic & in-discipline workshops delivered outside the unit

Integrated
In discipline workshops & lectures

Embedded
Collaboration with academic staff on curriculum reform

Embedded, integrated
Collaboration with academic staff & in-discipline teaching

Embedded, integrated, team taught
Unit Specific Model
Unit Specific Model

- Discipline-specific content
- Unit Support Program (USP)
- Academic literacies development
Embedding over 15 years: 2003-2018

1. Adjunct

2. Integrated (Paired Reading Program)

3. Embedded & Integrated

4. Embedded, Integrated & Team taught

5. Unit Specific Model
UC Project

- Unit Support Program, an embedded, integrated and team taught program implemented across first, second and third years in three units across two disciplines:
  - *Introduction to Management (1\textsuperscript{st} year)* – 525 students
  - *Organisational Behaviour (2\textsuperscript{nd} year)* – 220 students
  - *Contemporary Issues in Society (3\textsuperscript{rd} year)* – 160 students

- One-hour workshop (immediately after lecture) over 12 teaching weeks of semester.
Unit Support Program (USP) design

**Workshops:**
- paralleled weekly unit content as presented in each lecture
- focused concurrently on imminent assessment tasks
- facilitated by two teachers: an academic literacies teacher and discipline expert

**Focus on:**
- academic literacies: critical-analytical reading (Wingate, 2011)
- disciplinary literacies: discipline knowledge in a manner appropriate for university
Supporting assessment

- **Academic literacies** development incorporated into all assessment tasks across the three units. *For eg. academic essay*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaffolding academic essay</th>
<th>Sub-set of learning tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Analysing and deconstructing essay questions;</td>
<td>• Navigating through a journal article;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selecting and evaluating information sources;</td>
<td>• Identifying relevant ideas from a variety of genres;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Synthesising information from multiple sources and incorporating these into students’ own writing; and</td>
<td>• Using appropriate note-taking strategies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning and drafting the essay.</td>
<td>• Paraphrasing and summarising techniques;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conventions of citations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preparation of essay outlines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

- **Primary data collection:**
  - Student attendance
  - Retention data
  - Pass-fail rates
  - Final student results

- **Secondary data collection:**
  - Pre-diagnostic test results compared with -
    - Final students results
    - Major assessment results (exam and essay)
Result 1: Who did the USP attract?

- Distribution marks for 3rd year unit for USP (n=45) and Non-USP cohorts (n=84)
**Result 2: Greater retention**

Unit retention rates 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>USP 2, 2013</th>
<th>No USP 1, 2014</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITM % retained (cohort size)</td>
<td>87.0 (560)</td>
<td>66.2 (195)</td>
<td>0.000(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB % retained (cohort size)</td>
<td>90.8 (218)</td>
<td>86.3 (241)</td>
<td>0.066(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA % retained (cohort size)</td>
<td>86.1 (144)</td>
<td>91.6 (95)</td>
<td>0.20(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Result 3: Higher pass rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>USP</th>
<th>Non-USP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITM (N= 487)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91.0 (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB (N= 221)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA (N= 129)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80 (36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_b The z-test for proportions requires at least five students in each category (i.e. pass or fail), and so would not be valid to apply for the OB cohort._
Result 4: Improved final marks

Average final mark comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>USP attendees</th>
<th>Non-USP attendees</th>
<th>p^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITM (N = 487)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65.6 (12.3)</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB (N = 198)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66.3 (14.5)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA (N = 124)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56.4 (13.7)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a One-tailed t-test assuming equal variances.
Secondary data results

• Comparisons between
  • Pre-tests and final results
  • Pre-tests and exam results
  • Pre-tests and essay results
Result 5: Enhanced performance
Summary of findings

• Data based on student attendance, retention data, pass-fail rates, final student results.

• **Benefits of Unit Specific Model:**
  • Better engagement
  • Greater retention in the unit
  • Higher pass rates in first and third years
  • Above average final marks
  • Increased understanding of unit content
Conclusion – *The future of genres*

- **Limitations of model** - costly, complex, resource-intensive, unsustainable

- **The future of teaching academic genres lies in two areas:**
  - *an interdisciplinary teaching and learning model* through a faculty-wide and/or institution wide approach to developing students’ academic literacies
  - the *capacity of non-EAP specialists* (i.e. discipline teachers) to not only become meta aware of the unique genres of their discipline, but also teach those genres within the context of their own classrooms.

- **Reconceptualisation of teaching and learning** - academic literacies and content relevant to all and integrated within disciplinary learning, teaching and assessment.

Any questions?


