A genre-based study of professional reflective writing in higher education

Marion Heron & Erika Corradini

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

A genre-based study of professional reflective writing in higher education

Marion Heron [a] and Erika Corradini[b]

aDepartment of Higher Education, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK; bCentre for Higher Education Practice, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

ABSTRACT

There is a growing expectation internationally that teachers in higher education obtain professional recognition through accredited schemes which confer Fellowship status. Such schemes often require a written reflective submission to demonstrate effective teaching and professional experience. Yet despite this burgeoning interest, little is known about the generic features of professional reflective writing, and in particular, the 'case study' as part of a fellowship submission. Through a genre analysis of a corpus of case studies taken from successful texts we illuminate the rhetorical and linguistic features of the case study to inform writing support for teachers in higher education. We suggest how a genre pedagogy approach can both provide scaffolding to teachers engaging in professional reflective writing and empower teachers to manage new writing discourses by developing the tools of genre analysis.

Introduction

This study was motivated by a desire to better understand the rhetorical and linguistic features of the case study as part of reflective writing. In particular, the aim of the genre analysis study was to develop a genre pedagogy for higher education (HE) teachers writing for professional recognition. Both internationally and in the UK there is a growing expectation in higher education institutions (HEIs) for university teachers to obtain professional recognition for their educational activities (Asghar and Pilkington 2018; Shaw 2018). In the current climate of performativity in HE, teachers are expected to demonstrate their impact in a number of different ways. Although in this study we use the context of the AdvanceHE Fellowship scheme, our analysis and genre pedagogy approach will resonate with those who support teachers in demonstrating professional expertise and 'impactful writing' in other schemes.

Advance HE is the HE sector agency for learning and teaching, equality, diversity and leadership in HE (AdvanceHE 2020). Applications to the Fellowship scheme are often based on written reflective accounts in which teachers have to demonstrate their knowledge, teaching skills and professional values in relation to a professional standard

framework (AdvanceHE 2020). The ability to write a case study which highlights both the author's engagement with professional values, activities and core knowledge, as well as their impact on the practice of others, requires rhetorical and linguistic knowledge of the features of this very specialist genre. HE teachers come from a range of disciplinary backgrounds and some may find the case study linguistically, rhetorically and epistemologically unfamiliar (Hathaway 2015; Vassilaki 2017). Indeed, this research highlights the very specialist nature of reflective writing required for the case study with its implicit requirements, rendering the genre potentially inaccessible to writers who may be more familiar with objective, structured and linear genres (Hyland 2008). Considering that the Fellowship award scheme (AdvanceHE 2020) is used both nationally and internationally (Beckmann 2017, 2018) as an internal criterion for promotion and appraisal, and an external criterion for cv currency, identification of these features is both timely and needed.

In this research we adopt an approach based on genre theory. Genre is central to genre pedagogy as 'explicit knowledge of a genre's linguistic and rhetorical conventions facilitates the process of learning to write effectively' (McGrath and Kaufhold 2016, 936). Genre pedagogic writing support has generally been the domain of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP), yet the tools of genre analysis which inform pedagogic support through both teaching approach and resources are highly relevant and meaningful for all writers, regardless of linguistic background. A genre awareness of the case study can result in better quality outputs (Vassilaki 2017) and more informed teaching (Shi, Delahunty, and Gao 2019).

Genre analysis and genre pedagogy

Genre refers to 'abstract, socially recognised ways of using language' (Hyland 2007, 149) and represents a specific communicative purpose recognised by experts in the community and genre analysis, in particular move analysis, is a method for examining how language operates in a particular genre to fulfil this communicative function. Moves are defined as 'typical rhetorical steps that writers or speakers use to develop their social purposes' and the work of the analyst is to 'identify what each move is doing, its boundaries, its typical realisations, and how it contributes to the text as a whole' (Hyland 2013, 98–99). Further linguistic analysis aims to identify genre-functional formulae (Hüttner 2008, 2010) which are typical or common fixed phrases which writers may use to serve a communicative function. Knowledge of the lexico-grammatical features of the genre is indicative of belonging to a particular discourse community and constitutes a significant dimension of writing expertise (Tardy 2009). This writing knowledge can be extremely useful for writers as a guide to writing in a genre with which they may be unfamiliar and or uncomfortable (Lea and Street 2006).

One constraint of studying the genre of a case study is the lack of access to authentic exemplars (Li and Deng 2019), rendering its requirements implicit. The gate-keeping feature of this occluded genre is a key tension as professional recognition and therefore potential promotion and appraisal outcomes are granted on the basis of the writing (Leigh 2016; Li and Deng 2019). The only guidance comprises the descriptors and criteria which, like all assessment rubrics, can be open to interpretation (Bloxham et al. 2016) and is useful only when matched with an exemplar.

The case study

Although reflective writing is a notoriously complex rhetorical activity (Ryan 2011), there has been some attempt to identify its rhetorical and linguistic features. In a data set of 20 texts, Reidsema and Mort (2009) found that reflective writing in engineering case studies consist of explanation and evaluation, with temporal, causal and appraisal vocabulary. Ryan (2011) suggests that reflective writing typically includes recount, description, explanation and discussion. She identifies linguistic features as first person pronoun, nominalisation, technical/disciplinary lexis and academic citations. In a social work context, Rai's (2006) analysis confirms those features described above. In particular, she notes the use of first person pronoun and defined academic conventions such as syntax, grammar, the validity and use of evidence and argument (790). However, not all disciplinary genres reflect these grammatical, lexical and syntactic features. In his study on the use of self-mentions across disciplinary writing, Hyland (2008) notes that in the sciences writers will avoid the use of personal pronouns in order to 'downplay' (555) their role in the research and distance themselves from their actions. Yet, in reflective writing required for a case study, the writer must use personal pronouns to demonstrate and evidence the impact of their professional practice, and in particular, evidence their leadership, mentoring and supervision (see Table 1 below for the case study instructions). Making this genre requirement explicit through a genre pedagogy to support teachers from disciplines in which 'self-promotion' and use of self-mention is alien and at odds with their typical academic professional practice (Lea and Street 2006) is a key argument of this paper.

The case study therefore reflects elements of interdiscursivity (Bhatia 2006), or discursive hybridity (Molle and Prior 2008) as it combines personal reflection using academic conventions, such as academic vocabulary and referencing, with elements of self-promotion evidencing professional growth. The writer has to understand what forms impact may take and present themselves favourably by evidencing this impact on others' practice. Crucially, demonstrating impact has become a ubiquitous feature of universities' remit through the Research Excellence Framework (Watermeyer 2014) and the Teaching Excellence Framework (Forstenzer 2016), highlighting that the notion of impact has expanded to all areas of university activity.

This study was motivated by a desire to develop an appropriate pedagogy to support teachers in their writing and raise their awareness of the role of language in making claims for fellowship. While we chose to analyse case studies written for Fellowship of HEA (AdvanceHE 2020) because of its intrinsically professional nature, the outcomes of the study are potentially applicable to professional writing more broadly speaking. We felt that genre analysis was appropriate to our aim due to its focus on a linguistic analysis of authentic texts and its application to teaching (Parkinson 2017). Conducting a genre analysis can provide a prototype which can then be used to support new writers in understanding the genre (Biber et al. 2007). The advantages of a genre-based pedagogy have been outlined by Hyland (2007), and the use of exemplars provides an explicit and supportive tool for developing academic writing (Cheng 2014). However, perhaps the most fundamental argument, also relevant to this paper, is that genre pedagogy can be empowering. Through an understanding and awareness of how language works participants can 'exploit the expressive potential of society's discourse structures instead of merely being manipulated by them' (Hyland 2007, 150). By demystifying the

genre through the analysis of texts, this study aims to raise teachers' awareness of the rhetorical and linguistic features of the genre recognising that the ability to use these features in professional writing is both developmental and empowering.

Method

Context and participants

The method followed in the study is based on the collection and analysis of qualitative data. Case studies extracted from fellowship applications were collected at two universities in the UK (upon obtaining participants' ethical approval) and analysed as explained below. In order to achieve recognition, teachers work with mentors who have been through the process. In both universities involved in this project, case studies of a minimum of 1000 words centred on examples of teaching practice were collected and analysed. These texts are professionally assessed to a set of nationally and internationally recognised criteria which are part of the UK Professional Standards Framework (AdvanceHE 2020). The ability (or lack thereof) to construct a convincing narrative around one's journey to exerting impact as a teaching and learning practitioner is thus at the core of writing reflectively for this particular type of professional recognition. Hence case studies are assessed on the criteria but also on the often intrinsic ability to articulate a narrative of professional growth, based on a critical appraisal of activities as opposed to a description of them. Participants in this study were typically teaching fellows, lecturers or educators in academic services with teaching or student learning support responsibilities and who were at the time on a trajectory to become leaders in teaching and learning.

Data set

The data set consists of 72 case studies from 22 successful Senior Fellow applications, totalling around 60,300 words. We chose successful submissions as these are more likely to represent expectations of the genre (Parkinson 2017). Although the corpus would be considered small according to some definitions (see Flowerdew 2004, who states that a less than 250,000 word corpus is small), it represents a 'purpose-built corpora' (Hüttner 2010, 199) chosen specifically to represent Senior Fellowship case studies. Small studies can illuminate features of professional academic writing which, although may not entirely replicate or reflect the genre found in all institutions, can inform the support provided to staff in writing reflectively and in developing professionally. The writers of the corpus came from diverse disciplinary and linguistic backgrounds.

Methods

Analysis

We followed the stages of genre analysis outlined by Biber et al. (2007) and demonstrated in Parkinson (2017). We firstly identified the rhetorical purpose of the genre with reference to the instructions (see Table 1). The purpose of the case study is to demonstrate impact on others through sustained activities in teaching, leadership and mentoring. The criteria helped us to predict what the semantic themes (steps) might be and we

Table 1. Instructions for the case study.

In this section of your application, provide reflective accounts of two particular contributions or experiences which:

- have had a significant impact upon the co-ordination, support, supervision, management and/or mentoring of others (whether individuals and/or teams), in relation to learning and teaching
- demonstrate your sustained effectiveness in relation to learning and teaching and that you meet the criteria for Senior Fellowship

Use the two case studies to address different aspects of Descriptor 3, with a focus on your organisation, leadership and/or management of specific aspects of learning and teaching provision. Taken from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/downloads/SFHEA%20Guidance%20Notes%20for%20Applicants.pdf

piloted this list individually on three texts. We then collated results and agreed on a protocol of moves and steps which we used to code a further ten texts. In this stage we found that some moves and steps were more frequent than others. We looked to Hüttner's (2010) typology of obligatory, core, ambiguous and optional moves. Since our study was qualitative in nature, we focused on the core moves, defined as 'typical of the genre, considered part of an appropriate and acceptable genre exemplar' (Hüttner 2010, 205). We checked our analysis, refined the protocol and coded the remaining texts. Finally we developed the final protocol based on strongly prototypical moves (Hyland 2013, 99). Nvivo was used throughout to organise the moves and steps and store qualitative examples from texts which reflected common linguistic indicators of these steps.

In the linguistic analysis we identified formulaic sequences, in particular genre-functional formulae, defined as 'sequences that further the communicative purposes of a particular genre move' (Hüttner 2010, 204). We felt these were key to drive the core moves and steps identified, and reflected good practice in academic writing. Peters and Pauwels (2015, 28) argue that 'Mastery of academic FS [formulaic sequences] is crucial if one wants to succeed as an academic writer'. In other words, we were interested in the common lexical phrases that successful writers used to indicate certain moves and steps as we felt these could highlight typical patterns and also be appropriated by others in their own writing to achieve the same communicative functions. Our final protocol, including genre-functional formulae in the form of examples, was validated by expert informants' feedback (see below).

Expert informant validation

In order to validate the analysis we consulted three experienced assessors of HEA Fellowship written submissions. Two were assessors external to the institutions in the study, and one was an assessor based internally. Experts who can provide a professional validation are referred to in a number of ways, as disciplinary informant (Parkinson 2017), insider informant (Hyland 2013, 100) and expert user (Hüttner, Smit, and Mehlmauer-Larcher 2009). The justification for consulting expert informants is their experience and expertise of the genre, and their membership of the Fellowship discourse community. Through their role as assessor, they also occupy a gatekeeper position (Hüttner 2010). It was important for us that this prototype be recognised as typical of the genre by expert users to validate its communicative purpose. All expert informants commented on the accuracy of the protocol. For example, Informant 1 stated the following about the prototype (as presented in Table 2): 'It makes sense, is very familiar, and makes clear for the layperson how some of the "moves" actually look in a narrative'. Informant 1 also commented that on the

Table 2. Moves, steps and examples of formulaic examples in a case study.

Move 1: Introduction
Step 1: Justifying choice of case study
a. I have chosen this example as an illustration of my leadership of learning and teaching across the range of disciplinary areas.
b. [The case study] demonstrates the extent of my impact upon, and support of, other academic staff. Step 2: Introducing the problem
c. When I joined the University of X, the Y Department had problems with writing appropriate learning outcomes for the revalidation documents
d. There was a clear case of negative washback and a lack of alignment between the assessment method and the desired outcomes of the course. Step 3: Describing roles
e. I strengthened my leadership and managerial skills
f. This example demonstrates well how I have championed innovative approaches to teaching and student support.
Move 2: Describing the problem and detailed actions Step 1: Describing the problem
g. There was a lot of hostility towards observation in general and many colleagues were reluctant to allow peers to observe their classes.
Step 2: Detailing leadership, mentoring, supervision
h. The Learning and Teaching Weeks are an initiative that I developed and implemented across the University of X.
Step 3: Demonstrating engagement with scholarship
i. To prepare I immersed myself in the scholarly literature on educational uses of EVS and its pros and cons (e.g. Beatty, 2004; Fies and Marshall 2006).
j. I consulted the literature on peer observation
k. Feedback is a key component of student evaluations (Roscoe and Chi 2008).
Step 4: Describing detailed actions l.
I therefore had to carefully plan the process as it required the coordinating and liaising with staff who had other demands on their time.
Step 5: Stating beliefs / justifying actions with beliefs
m. I was keen to develop a holistic approach to …
 Move 3: Describing and evidencing impact
Step 1: Talking about impact
n. Feedback from the students was overwhelmingly positive
o. The result was the development of a network of more experienced and senior staff who were concerned with evidence-informed assessment …
Step 2: Introducing testimonial
p. Feedback from staff included the following:
Step 3: Reflecting on learning
q. I feel I have learned from last year's experience and have a clearer idea of what type of texts and questions the students need.
Step 4: Reference to wider context of HE and future
r. I am now interested in how a locally managed course can be developed for an international audience.

empirical basis of the prototype and described it as 'entirely compelling'. Informant 2 commented on the utility of the prototype: 'This will be really useful for anyone developing their SFHEA application in terms of the types of things to include', supporting our claims for to the pedagogic utility of this study. Further feedback on the protocol is integrated into our presentation of the data in the following section.

Rhetorical moves in case studies

In the sections below we outline and describe the core moves and steps of the prototype with examples of formulaic sequences which signal and mark the various rhetorical functions. The prototype is first summarised in Table 2.

Core moves in the case study

In the analysis we found core moves with corresponding steps (Hüttner 2010). However, the steps also constituted core rather than fixed steps and as such are not necessarily in a

fixed order. The variability and lack of conformity could be attributed to the self-pro-motional, persuasive characteristic of the case study. Biber et al. (2007, 34) note that 'in some genres, especially dynamic and persuasion-oriented ones like fundraising letter, may have obligatory, typical, and optional move elements, and move types may not necessarily occur in a fixed order'. Steps were also found to be typical, rather than obligatory.

We found that case studies typically included three main moves with some variation in the length and position of each move. The *Introducing the case study* move generally provides the context of the case study and establishes the role of the writer. The second move, *Describing actions*, speaks to the need for the writer to describe and highlight their active role in the case study. Strong, active nouns are provided in the instructions (e.g. supervision, management, mentoring) resulting in large sections of the case study in which writers provide details of their roles and actions. The third move, *Evidencing impact*, is the key move as it identifies and illuminates the impact and influence the writer has had on others, and makes the claim which is key to evidencing Senior Fellowship.

Moves, steps and formulaic sequences in the case study

Move 1

Step 1, Justifying choice of case study, was used by some writers to set the scene and make explicit, direct reference to their roles in terms of leadership. The notion of 'boasting' (Tardy 2005) is signalled by phrases such as 'an illustration of my leadership'. These phrases reflect the key terms used in the instructions for the case study, and this technique draws the attention of the assessor to the fulfilment of the criteria. Step 2, Introducing the problem, was not used by all writers, but the more coherent case studies presented either a problem or a challenge to which the writer provides a solution. Presenting a problem allowed the writer to more clearly demonstrate impact in terms of their subsequent actions and leadership, the key purpose of the case study. Step 3, Describing roles mirrored some of the communicative purpose as Step 1, where writers explicitly referred to how their roles are aligned to leadership, mentoring, and managing. These were general references to the roles, further emphasis is made in Move 2. Not all writers used this step, but since these roles are explicitly referred to in the instructions for the case study, this step allowed signposting to the active participation of the writer.

However, although we found that most writers used move 1, Introducing the case study, this may not always make the account more convincing. Expert informant 3 commented: 'I'm not quite so convinced about your 'move 1'. Mostly I find 'introductory remarks' to be a waste of words – as an assessor I don't particularly need to know why the case has been selected so long as it is made apparent that it meets the criteria'. This expert perspective is illuminating, and perhaps highlights the subjective nature of assessing this sub-genre of reflection. Considering the large number of writers who provided an introduction to the case study, we would argue that this move is important because it allows the writer to use a rhetorical move (Introduction) which is familiar to them in other academic genres. Hüttner (2010, 202) argues that teachers and assessors can exercise flexibility when evaluating student writing:

A further and arguably more innovative reaction to such an awareness would be for teachers to recognise potentially valid communicative intentions of student writers and thus allow some negotiation of what should be included in student academic writing or to allow for different forms of outlet for these communicative needs.

Move 2

Step 1, Describing the problem, provides an opportunity for the writer to explain the challenges and difficulties in context. As mentioned above, a problem or challenge allows the writer to better present their leadership and management skills, and affords them the opportunity to present their 'best self' in context. Impact is better evidenced when there is a challenge to overcome. Step 2, Detailing leadership, mentoring and supervision, reflects the requirements of the case study instructions to articulate how the teacher has supervised or managed. This was often signposted in Move 1 step 3, but writers provided more details in Move 2. Of particular note is how agency and authorial voice are marked by personal pronoun 'I' (Rai 2006; Ryan 2011). Step 3, Demonstrating engagement with scholarship, reflects the requirements of the professional accreditation scheme to demonstrate engagement with evidence-informed teaching and scholarship. Writers used typical academic conventions for reference to scholarship, through in-text citations. Evidence-based practice is a much-used term in the educational literature and these explicit references to literature demonstrate that the writer engages in robust processes, elevating their professional status and confirming their claim for membership of the community of HE professionals. The use of citations in this way further supports our earlier argument that reflective writing for fellowship is a sub-genre of academic reflective writing, contrasted with what might be referred to as diary reflective writing (Rai 2006). Step 4, Describing detailed actions, was a core step and comprised a large bulk of the case study. There was overlap with Move 2, Step 2. The detailed actions were written in a narrative form, with the aim of telling the story and reflect the notion of 'sustained effectiveness' (see Table 1). Step 5, Justifying actions with beliefs, allows writers to make reference to their philosophy of teaching, learning and possibly mentoring. Many writers in earlier parts of the application write about their philosophy of teaching, and so here may make reference to this. Expert informant 3 suggested that Move 2 in this structure reflects two separate moves: 'I wondered if you have two separate moves contained within your Move 2, i.e. description (what actually happened) and the provision of an evidence-based rationale for doing it like that. It is within the rationale that I might typically expect to see the literature consulted'. Whilst this division of moves might seem plausible, we found that writers made multiple references to actions and their rationale, and therefore reflect steps rather than overall rhetorical functions of the text.

Move 3

Evidencing impact is key to requirements for conferring the award of Senior Fellow. The writer must demonstrate impact across different spheres of influence, e.g. students, colleagues in the department, other departments, potentially other institutions. In Step 1, Talking about impact, writers used a variety of rhetorical devices, for example, the use of statistics and certain linguistic devices (see examples in Table 2). Some writers signalled their impact through scholarly activity and dissemination. This use of formulaic sequences also highlights the scholarly impact, as well as validation of their work by external members.

In Step 2, Introducing testimonials, the writer further evidences their impact but through the 'voice' of others. This step was a core step and crucial to the application. Step 3, Reflecting on learning, was not found in all case studies. Reflecting on the case study experience speaks to the reflective nature of the genre and positions the writer as life-long learners, an attribute which further supports the claim to professional recognition. Step 4, Referencing the future, allows writers to make reference to their future practice. This reflects the need to demonstrate 'sustained' engagement with pedagogic practice (see Table 1).

Expert informant 3 suggested Move 3 be comprised of two moves:

> Similarly, I wonder if there are two steps in your M3. Success must be demonstrated and I would see introducing testimonials as part of that. Similarly, reflections that conclude it all worked (but not those that conclude otherwise). Potentially the other move is something like 'so what?' – something about where the practice needs to go next or a problem to be solved in the next iteration of the practice.

Whilst we would agree that the 'so what', reference to the future is important, and is generally considered a crucial part of reflective writing, it is not key to the reflective account and is not a requirement stated in the instructions. Not all writers used Move 3, Step 4, and so whilst it contributes to the overall communicative function of future impact, its centrality is not borne out by the data. Again, the expert informant's comments reflect the 'desired' and the 'actual', or the difference between the expectations and knowledge of an 'insider', and those submitting, not yet members of the discourse community.

Discussion

The case study as a genre

The aim of the genre analysis was to identify the rhetorical structure of a case study in order to demystify the genre and make it more accessible to teachers preparing for Fellowship. The result of the analysis is a prototype which reflects the core moves and steps of a case study (Hüttner 2010). Whilst we acknowledge that not all case studies followed identical structures, the prototype which emerged from the common moves and steps was based on insider knowledge (Flowerdew 2005) gained from our roles as academic developers, and verified by our expert informants (Parkinson 2017). We believe therefore that generic integrity (Bhatia 2006, 80) has been confirmed. The challenges of writing the case study may be mitigated by the explicit structure of the prototype and provide familiarity for those teachers who find the genre alien to their usual disciplinary writing (Hyland 2008). We found that the case study reflected the features of reflective writing found by Ryan (2011) and Rai (2006) with the additional rhetorical features of evidencing impact through strong statements of action and self-promotion (Wharton 2012; Li and Deng 2019). The final prototype is descriptive thus allowing for versatility and flexibility (Bhatia 2006) within a coherent structure. The use of formulaic sequences affords the writer both genre-appropriate language which mark the communicative function of the move (Hüttner 2010; Peters and Pauwels 2015).

Genre pedagogy

As described in the introduction, this study has been pedagogically motivated. The aim was to analyse a corpus of successful case studies to determine a prototype which could

be a reference point for novice writers seeking to engage with the discoursal features and linguistic devices of a potentially unfamiliar genre. According to Hyland (2007), genre writing pedagogy is underpinned by the following principles:

- Learning to write is needs-oriented.
- Learning to write requires explicit outcomes and expectations.
- Learning to write is a social activity especially evidenced in the mentor/applicant relationship.
- Learning to write involves learning to use language (Genre-specific linguistic devices)

Although genre pedagogy has been criticised in its purpose of developing communicative competence in a particular genre with reference to the accepted discourse practices, with some scholars arguing that the ethics of academic literacy should be to question and critique the genre, rather than just conforming (Hyland 2013), we believe that the identification of the rhetorical and linguistic features of a case study does in fact empower staff and stimulate their professional development as argued above (Vassilaki 2017). Move analysis can inform their writing and support their development of competence of the genre. We would argue that in the context of professional academic writing which can confer professional recognition and membership to a community of Senior Fellows, this knowledge is crucial.

Perhaps the main distinction to be made is between genre acquisition and genre awareness (Paltridge 2013). Presenting novice writers with a prototype may imply a more passive acceptance of the genre. However, genre awareness activities can develop the acquisition of the tools of analysis and understanding how to move between genres and discourses. In other words, writing support should focus not just on how to follow the genre, but also to understand it so writers can adapt it to other discourses. Writers should develop genre awareness to equip them in managing new discourse practices in which they may find themselves, as HE is a constantly changing environment. In other words, writing for fellowship is much more than a tick-box exercise (Shaw 2018).

Genre pedagogy in action

Writing intervention through input, guidance and 'how to' support has been found to be effective with HE teachers in developing academic professional writing (Rickard et al. 2009). However, this support may remain superficial in the absence of knowledge and awareness of the genre's rhetorical and linguistic features (McGrath and Kaufhold 2016). We suggest adopting an approach often used in genre-based teaching, which fundamentally incorporates both genre awareness and genre acquisition. The initial focus is on recognition of rhetorical and linguistic features followed by production of these features. Cheng (2014, 53) refers to this approach as a discovery-based orientation which aims to '(re)situate in the students' own eyes the generic features and the disciplinary practices behind these features'. We also argue that writing and using formulaic sequences can support thinking. Genre-based pedagogy employs the ideas of Vygotsky (1986) for peer learning and the role of social interaction, and Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) for the notion of scaffolding. This is demonstrated through the modelling of texts, writing frames (templates), explicit instruction, teacher input and intervention. Formulaic

sequences can be highlighted through analysis, particularly when the moves and steps are deconstructed. As mentioned above, the use of these move sequences indicate a communicative function and so are inextricably linked to the purpose of the writer. Moving from recognition through a combination of move analysis with an identification of linguistic features to production of own texts is suggested by Parkinson (2017). This is the approach we endorse for working with teachers.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to develop a genre pedagogy approach based on empirical data from a small corpus of successful case studies as part of claim for Fellowship. The analysis provided a prototype of a case study comprising rhetorical features and linguistic devices. Although a genre pedagogy approach is often found in the domain of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and therefore aimed at supporting those who have English as a second language, we argue that this organised and structured approach could provide access to a potentially unfamiliar genre for all teachers, regardless of linguistic background. Similarly, although based in the context of AdvanceHE fellowship writing, a genre analysis perspective on supporting writing with staff is relevant to all aspects of professional academic writing. This evidence-informed approach can be usefully applied to supporting staff in other areas of professional academic writing, such as research grants, abstracts or scientific communications. Our overarching aim is to produce tools which enable academics in professional writing. This would result in confidence to write in new discourses and move across different discourses by using their genre analytic tools to understand the new genre and make it work for them. Furthermore, the tools and awareness could support staff to develop professionally.

The analysis in this study was entirely text-based, and an area for further research and genre analysis of other professional writing about teaching could include interviews with the writers. Accessing the writer's intention would shed further light on the communicative purpose of the moves and steps and would result in a more robust prototype.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Marion Heron 🔵 http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6129-1265

References

AdvanceHE. 2020. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/.
Asghar, M., and R. Pilkington. 2018. "The Relational Value of Professional Dialogue for Academics Pursuing HEA Fellowship." *International Journal for Academic Development* 23 (2): 135–146.
Beatty, I. 2004. *Transforming Student Learning with Classroom Communication Systems*. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Centre for Applied Research: Research Bulletin 3.

Beckmann, E. A. 2017. "Leadership Through Fellowship: Distributed Leadership in a Professional Recognition Scheme for University Educators." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 39 (2): 155–168.

Beckmann, E. A. 2018. "Professional Staff, Professional Recognition: Bringing Learner Support Staff Into the Fellowship of University Educators." In *Professional and Support Staff in Higher Education*, edited by C. Bossu and N. Brown, 277–292. Singapore: Springer.

Bhatia, V. K. 2006. "Analysing Genre: Some Conceptual Issues." In *Academic Writing in Context: Implications and Applications*, edited by M. Hewings, 79–82. Birmingham: Continuum.

Biber, D., U. Connor, T. A. Upton, and B. Kanoksilapatham. 2007. "Introduction to Move Analysis." In *Discourse on the Move: Using Discourse Analysis to Describe Discourse Structure*, edited by D. Biber, U. Connor and T. A. Upton, 23–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bloxham, S., B. den-Outer, J. Hudson, and M. Price. 2016. "Let's Stop the Pretence of Consistent Marking: Exploring the Multiple Limitations of Assessment Criteria." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 41 (3): 466–481.

Cheng, Y. H. 2014. "Dissertation Grant Proposals as "Writing Games": An Exploratory Study of two L2 Graduate Students' Experiences." *English for Specific Purposes* 36: 74–84.

Fies, C., and J. Marshall. 2006. "Classroom Response Systems: A Review of the Literature." *Journal of Science Education and Technology* 15 (1): 101–109.

Flowerdew, L. 2004. "The Argument for Using English Specialized Corpora to Understand Academic and Professional Language." In *Discourse in the Professions: Perspectives From Corpus Linguistics*, edited by U. Connor and T. S. Upton, 11–33. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Flowerdew, L. 2005. "An Integration of Corpus-Based and Genre-Based Approaches to Text Analysis in EAP/ESP: Countering Criticisms Against Corpus-Based Methodologies." *English for Specific Purposes* 24 (3): 321–332.

Forstenzer, J. I. 2016. The Teaching Excellence Framework: What's the Purpose? http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/127959/1/TEF-Whats-the-Purpose-booklet-Josh-Forstenzer%281%29.pdf.

Hathaway, J. 2015. "Developing That Voice: Locating Academic Writing Tuition in the Mainstream of Higher Education." *Teaching in Higher Education* 20 (5): 506–517. doi:10.1080/13562517.2015.1026891.

Hüttner, J. 2008. "The Genre (s) of Student Writing: Developing Writing Models." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 18 (2): 146–165.

Hüttner, J. 2010. "The Potential of Purpose-Built Corpora in the Analysis of Student Academic Writing in English." *Journal of Writing Research* 2: 197–218.

Hüttner, J., U. Smit, and B. Mehlmauer-Larcher. 2009. "ESP Teacher Education at the Interface of Theory and Practice: Introducing a Model of Mediated Corpus-Based Genre Analysis." *System* 37 (1): 99–109.

Hyland, K. 2007. "Genre Pedagogy: Language, Literacy and L2 Writing Instruction." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16 (3): 148–164. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005.

Hyland, K. 2008. "Genre and Academic Writing in the Disciplines." *Language Teaching* 41 (4): 543–562.

Hyland, K. 2013. "ESP and Writing." In *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*, edited by B. Paltridge, and S. Starfield, 95–113. Oxford: Wiley Blackman.

Lea, M. R., and B. V. Street. 2006. "The" Academic Literacies" Model: Theory and Applications." *Theory Into Practice* 45 (4): 368–377.

Leigh, J. 2016. "An Embodied Perspective on Judgements of Written Reflective Practice for Professional Development in Higher Education." *Reflective Practice* 17 (1): 72–85.

Li, Y., and L. Deng. 2019. "I am What I Have Written: A Case Study of Identity Construction in and Through Personal Statement Writing." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 37: 70–87.

McGrath, L., and K. Kaufhold. 2016. "English for Specific Purposes and Academic Literacies: Eclecticism in Academic Writing Pedagogy." *Teaching in Higher Education* 21 (8): 933–947. doi:10.1080/13562517.2016.1198762.

Molle, D., and P. Prior. 2008. "Multimodal Genre Systems in EAP Writing Pedagogy: Reflecting on a Needs Analysis." *Tesol Quarterly* 42 (4): 541–566.

Paltridge, B. 2013. "Genre and English for Specific Purposes." In *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*, edited by B. Paltridge and S. Starfield, 347–366. Oxford: Wiley Blackman.

Parkinson, J. 2017. "The Student Laboratory Report Genre: A Genre Analysis." *English for Specific Purposes* 45: 1–13. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2016.08.001.

Peters, E., and P. Pauwels. 2015. "Learning Academic Formulaic Sequences." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 20: 28–39.

Rai, L. 2006. "Owning (up to) Reflective Writing in Social Work Education." *Social Work Education* 25 (8): 785–797. doi:10.1080/02615470600915845.

Reidsema, C., and P. Mort. 2009. "Assessing Reflective Writing: Analysis of Reflective Writing in an Engineering Design Course." *Journal of Academic Language and Learning* 3 (2): A117–A129.

Rickard, C. M., M. R. McGrail, R. Jones, P. O'Meara, A. Robinson, M. Burley, and G. Ray-Barruel. 2009. "Supporting Academic Publication: Evaluation of a Writing Course Combined with Writers' Support Group." *Nurse Education Today* 29 (5): 516–521.

Roscoe, R. D., and M. T. Chi. 2008. "Tutor Learning: The Role of Explaining and Responding to Questions." *Instructional Science* 36 (4): 321–350.

Ryan, M. 2011. "Improving Reflective Writing in Higher Education: A Social Semiotic Perspective." *Teaching in Higher Education* 16 (1): 99–111. doi:10.1080/13562517.2010.507311.

Shaw, R. 2018. "Professionalising Teaching in HE: the Impact of an Institutional Fellowship Scheme in the UK." *Higher Education Research & Development* 37 (1): 145–157.

Shi, L., J. Delahunty, and X. Gao. 2019. "Constraints Preventing Chinese EFL Teachers From Putting Their Stated Beliefs Into Teaching Practice." *Professional Development in Education* 45 (5): 774–789.

Tardy, C. M. 2005. ""It's Like a Story": Rhetorical Knowledge Development in Advanced Academic Literacy." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 4 (4): 325–338.

Tardy, C. M. 2009. *Building Genre Knowledge*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Vassilaki, E. 2017. "Reflective Writing, Reflecting on Identities: The Construction of Writer Identity in Student Teachers' Reflections." *Linguistics and Education* 42: 43–52.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1986. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Watermeyer, R. 2014. "Issues in the Articulation of 'Impact': the Responses of UK Academics to 'Impact' as a new Measure of Research Assessment." *Studies in Higher Education* 39 (2): 359–377.

Wharton, S. 2012. "Presenting a United Front: Assessed Reflective Writing on a Group Experience." *Reflective Practice* 13 (4): 489–501.

Wood, D., J. S. Bruner, and G. Ross. 1976. "The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 17 (2): 89–100.