مراجعة لنُهُوجِّ التحليل النمطي

A Review of Approaches to Genre Analysis

Dr. Juma'a Qadir Hussein
Assistant professor
University of Anbar-College of Education for Humanities- Department of English
Marwan Salah Abbas
Assistant lecturer
Directorate General of Education in Anbar

ed.juma.qader@uoanbar.edu.iq

marwan.alshojery@gmail.com

د. جمعة قادر حسين

أستاذ مساعد

جامعة الانبار – كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية – قسم اللغة الانكليزية

مروان صلاح عباس

مدرس مساعد

مديرية تربية الانبار

الملخص

يتم تناول التحليل النمطي من وجهات نظر نظرية وعملية مختلفة. ويلعب التحليل النمط دورا أساسيا في بناء نص وخطاب متماسكين على المستويين الهيكلي والوظيفي. الطريقة الصحيحة لإنتاج الخطاب، المنطوق أو المكتوب، هيكليا ووظيفيا يمكن المستمعين / القراء من فهم المعلومات المقدمة في النص بسهولة وفعالية. نظرا لأهميته في الخطاب المكتوب والمنطوق ، يتضمن التحليل النمطي نُهُوجِّ مختلفة لفحص الأشكال والوظائف اللغوية للخطاب. في هذا الصدد ، تم استعراض ثلاثة نُهُوجِّ بارزة: نهج اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض محددة (ESP) ، ونهج اللغويات الوظيفية النظامية (SFL) ، والنهج البلاغي الجديد. على الرغم من استخدام هذه الأساليب الثلاثة على نطاق واسع ، إلا أنها لم تخلو من القيود النظرية

والعملية. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقديم مراجعة نقدية لهذه النُهُوجِّ كما هي مستخدمة في أنواع مختلفة من السياقات. سلط هذا التحقيق الضوء على نقاط القوة والضعف لهذه النُهُوجِّ وقابلية تطبيقها وملائمتها لتحليل أنواع مختلفة من الخطابات المنطوقة والمكتوبة. على الرغم من التباين الكبير بين الأساليب الثلاثة ، أظهرت المراجعة أنها تكمل بعضها البعض. في حين أن نهج تماسك الخطاب يجيب على دور هذه العلامات في خلق تماسك الخطاب، فإن النهج القائم على الصلة يوضح بالأدلة أن هذه العلامات هي أدوات ضرورية في يد المتحدثين للتحكم في اتجاه خطابهم وكيف يمكن تفسير هذا الكلام دلاليا أوبراغماتيا من المستمعين.

Abstract

Genre analysis has been widely investigated from various theoretical and practical perspectives. Genre analysis was found to play an essential role in building up a coherent text and speech at the structural and functional levels. The proper way of producing discourse, spoken or written, structurally and functionally enables hearers/readers to comprehend information presented in the text easily and effectively. Due to its importance in written and spoken discourse, Genre analysis includes various approaches to examine the linguistic forms and functions of discourse. In this regard, three prominent approaches were reviewed: the English for Specific Purpose Approach (ESP), the Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach (SFL), and the New-Rhetorical Approach. Although these three approaches have widely been used, they were not without theoretical and practical limitations. The present study aims to provide a critical review of these approaches as used in various types of contexts. This investigation highlighted their strengths, weaknesses, applicability and suitability for analysing various types of spoken and written discourses. Despite the huge variance between the three approaches, the review showed they complete each other. While the discourse-coherence approach answers the role of these markers in creating discourse coherence, the relevance-based approach demonstrates with evidence that these markers are necessary tools in the hand of speakers to control the direction of their speech and how this speech can be interpreted whether semantically or pragmatically by hearers.

Introduction

Recently, the genre has made inroads within the discipline of linguistics. Halliday (1978) and others like Levinson (1979), and Miller (1984) have been interested in genre analysis linguistically. Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993) are considered the leading figures since they proposed the most influential definitions of genre. Three methods of modern genre studies are considered key concepts for genre analysis. Through its development, the genre experiences three main perspective views, particularly from Genres as Forms of Social Action − Rhetorical Genre Studies RGs, Genres as Forms of Communicative Actions - the English for Specific Purposes ESP and the Sydney school groups, Genres as Staged, Goal-Oriented Social Process−Systemic Functional Linguistics SFL.

Scholars have always been interested in genre despite the different theoretical backgrounds and approaches adopted to consider how genre functions within the context of use. The genre was once used to categorize texts and cultural objects. On the other hand, the genre has now been recognized as a "powerful, ideologically active and historically changing shaper of texts, meanings and social actions" used to organise and create kinds of texts and social actions in a dynamic way (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010:4). According to Bhatia (2002), realities of the world of texts are understood and accounted for through genre analyses as the real world is distinguished to be naturally both complex and dynamic. In line with Bhatia, Yunick (1997) and Hyland (2002) explain that studying genre is implemented due to scholars' call for the need to understand how language relates to its use and its culturally recognised context. Therefore, genre has continued to be studied and analysed, particularly by the proponents of the three recognizable genre

approaches mentioned above, Rhetorical Genre studies RGs, English for Specific Purposes ESP and Systemic Functional Linguistics SFL.

In this paper, multi-perspective views on genre will be discussed by reviewing definitions of genre, and views of genre theorists. Then, a review of each of the genre approaches is highlighted. Further, a discussion on some key features of the three approaches in terms of their similarities and differences. Finally, the paper ends with a discussion on genre and how it can be analysed and studied to derive insightful findings on specific uses and functions of genre.

An overview of genre analysis

Recently, many researchers have worked on the genre, particularly in language teaching and learning. It is to examine a variety of academic genres. Genre analysis, according to (Bhatia, Flowerdew, and Johnes, 2008), provides a grounded description and explanation of language use in academic and professional contexts. From a historical point of view, the term 'genre' may be traced back to Aristotle, who used it to refer to three primary genres of writing in his Poetics: poetry, drama, and the epic. These divisions have grown significantly. On the contrary, the concept of genre as a distinct sort of literature has persisted into the modern day. Simultaneously, it came to designate more popular cultural genres such as soap operas, film noir, westerns, and thrillers (Flowerdew, 2013).

In line with its emergence, genre first appeared to specify different types of literature: poetry, drama, movies … etc. It has been a popular paradigm for analyzing the form and purpose of scientific discourse in the last two decades, as well as a useful tool for establishing instructional methods in domains like rhetoric, professional writing, and English for Specific Purposes ESP. Genre-based methods have had a significant influence by building a

philosophy of language and education based on research into the linguistic structures of texts and the social settings in which they arise. Genre analysis may be defined as a broad phrase that encompasses a variety of methods and approaches to texts, ranging from extensive qualitative examination of a particular book to more quantitative counts of linguistic elements (Hyland 2009). Martin (1985) mentioned that when language is utilized to achieve goals, genres are how they are accomplished. Nonetheless, understanding the relationship between language and its context and applying this understanding to language instruction is the main goal of genre research (Hyland, 2002).

Genres are regarded as language-based activities that individuals participate in. Spoken genres include academic lectures and informal discussions. Written genres include newspaper reporting and scholarly articles. A genre's variants frequently share several characteristics. They can be spoken or written in a variety of ways, some of which are traditional. They frequently have the same role and goal (or set of functions and purposes). Genres are usually performed by a single individual (Paltridge, 2012). Furthermore, Bhatia (1993) argued that a genre is an identifiable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative aims that are identified and shared by members of the community in which it happens. It is frequently highly organized and conventionalized, with limitations on permissible contributions in terms of aim, placement, shape, and functional usefulness.

Expert members of the discourse community, on the other hand, frequently use these limits to attain private aims inside the framework of the socially accepted purpose (s). Moreover, Bhatia (2002) defined genre analysis as the study of situated language behaviour in institutionalized academic or professional contexts, which is a

commonly recognized concept that may be investigated. On the other hand, Swales (1990), the leading pioneer in genre and move analysis in the area of ESP, described a genre as a series of communication events shared by members of a specific community with a common set of communicative goals. Swales added that the concept of genre is defined as communication that has its own set of norms.

These norms are determined by the communicative goal of the context. For instance, the norms for writing social letters are not the same as the standards for writing novels or theses. Bloor & Bloor (1993) defined genre as a formal property of a social practice that may be specified and taught. They described genre as a textual quality that characterizes it as a series of motions or segments each of which fulfills a component of the text's overall communicative objective. Miller (1984) defined genre as a type of social action that occurred inside a given discourse notion and whose scope could be determined. Thus, genre can be varied according to the context in which it is used.

Bhatia (1993), and Bawarshi and Reiff (2010) proposed methods for analyzing genres, specifically textual genres. For example, we may choose to analyze a genre using a 'text-first' or a 'context-first' method (Flowerdew 2013). That is, we may start by looking at typical discourse patterns in the texts we're interested in (a text-first approach), or we can start by looking at the context of the texts we're interested in (a context-first approach). The phases should be employed freely and selectively based on the analysis' beginning point, objective, the feature of the genre we wish to focus on, and our level of prior understanding of the genre (Paltridge, 2012).

Paltridge (2012) added that there are three stages of genre-based analysis. The first stage is to gather samples of the genre you are interested in. Bhatia recommended using a small sample of texts for exploratory research, a single typical text for a comprehensive study, or

a larger sample of texts if we want to look into a few specific traits. Academically, the more genre examples you may collect, the better you'll be able to recognize typical elements of the genre. The second stage is to think about what you already know about the genre. This entails understanding the setting as well as any traditions that are normally connected with the genre. We can look for information in current literature such as guidebooks and manuals, as well as seek out practitioner guidance on the genre. It's also a good idea to look at previous assessments of the genre in question, as well as other comparable genres, by reading research articles or books on the subject.

The next stage is to fine-tune the analysis by identifying the text's speaker or writer, as well as the text's audience and their relationship to one another. That is, who utilizes the genre, who writes in it, who reads it, and what roles readers play while they read the book (Paltridge, 2012). As a result, the intent, or purpose, of the writings must also be considered. That is, why do authors write in this genre, why do readers read it, and what is the genre's purpose for those who utilize it? Another factor to examine is the genre's normal conversation patterns. That is, how are the texts often ordered, how are they typically presented in terms of layout and format, and what are some common language qualities in the genre? (Paltridge, 2012). What do people need to know to participate in the genre, and what worldview does the work assume its readers have? To put it another way, what attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions does the genre presume or expose (Bawarshi and Reiff 2010)? Thus, readers should also consider the networks of texts that surround the genre and how vital it is to understand these to compose or understand a particular genre (Paltridge, 2012).

Genres as Forms of Social Action−Rhetorical Genre Studies (RGs)

North American academics such as Miller (1984/1994), Bazerman (1988), Bizzell (1992), and Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995) are part of the 'New Rhetoric' school, which takes a distinct approach to the conception and study of the genre. The key goal for this school is to pay attention to the socio-contextual features of genres and how these components evolve through time, rather than focusing on the formal qualities of the texts in isolation. They also lay a strong focus on the social functions, or activities, that these genres serve in various contexts (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Hyons, 1996; Paltridge, 1997a), as cited (Mrtin-Martin, 2003).

Thus, genre knowledge is essentially social, placed in the community and context of the writer and audience, according to the New Rhetoric method, which focuses on the North American group. This approach emerged in the 1960s with a deep commitment to providing a powerful theoretical and historical foundation for the teaching of writing to all undergraduate students. Flowerdew (2002) divided genre theorists into linguistic and non-linguistic camps, identifying the New Rhetoric group as a non-linguistic group that views genre as 'social action' in its obsession. Carolyn Miller's key work 'Genre as a Social Action' (1984/1994) was the first to introduce New-rhetorical or rhetorical genre studies to contemporary studies.

According to Gruber (2013:31), the rhetorical genre study was primarily founded on the work of a group of researchers, including Bazerman 1988, and Freedman and Medway 1994, who combined ideas from classical rhetoric, and literary and communication studies. The relevance of historical contingency, as well as the cultural and historical situatedness of the genre, is emphasized in their work. However, some scholars, Bazerman, Medway, and others described this approach as a powerful framework for explaining genre for two reasons: first, in addition to its traditional focus on literature, more

attention has been paid to non-literary forms (written or spoken); and second, rather than focusing solely on the linguistic regularities of texts, the New-rhetorical has sought to understand the social, political, and rhetorical actions implied in these texts (Artemeva and Freedman, 2008). Furthermore, the New-principal rhetorician's focus was on textual regularities, particularly in literary works like sonnets, tragedies, and odes, which were described in terms of form and content rules. In addition, new rhetorical genre studies delve further, focusing on the textual aspects of non-literary writings like the lab report's objective, techniques, and observations. Without abandoning traditional definitions of genres as regularized types or kinds of discourse characterized by similarities in content and form, current genre studies concentrate on connecting linguistic and substantive similarities to regularities in human activity (Freedman and Medway, 1994).

Since the primary goal of New Rhetoric research is to uncover something of the attitudes, values, and beliefs of the communities of text users that genres imply and construct, their methodological orientation tends to be ethnographic (e.g. participant observation, unstructured interviews, etc.) rather than text analytic, to uncover something of the attitudes, values, and beliefs of the communities of text users that genres imply and construct (Hyland, 2002).

Genres as Forms of Communicative Actions−English for Specific Purposes (ESP)

Swale creates the Swalsean method known as the ESP Genre analysis approach (1981). It is a method of text analysis that investigates the structural regularities that identify one form of a text or genre from another (Dudley-Evans & St-Jon, 198F8). Such a method is not intended to construct a system for identifying genres; rather, it

examines how a book achieves its communication goals (Dudley-Evans, 1998). Thus, it was created to make students aware of various texts, particularly academic texts like university lectures and academic essays, to improve non-native students' capacity to comprehend and write academic writings effectively.

Lesiak-Bielawska (2015) suggested that the key goal was to see how different registers of English might be detected, such as the distinction between English for Electronic Engineering and English for Biology. Swales (1990) identified the term genre as it "comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre." (p.58). In this regard, Ramirez (2015) stated that the most significant contribution of English for Specific Purposes is Swales' (1981) Aspect of Article Introductions, which marked the start of a new phase in which Swales introduced his new method through his extensive study of Genre Analysis (1990). Due to its importance, this work prompted and aided the publication of a new series of articles that became known as the core of English for Specific Purposes.

In ESP, genre studies mostly focused on academic genres, particularly research publications, with a comparable theory and use of genre. This study has tremendously enriched our understanding of discipline-specific genres, particularly research articles and what Swales (1990, p.46) called 'occluded genres,' which work behind the scenes of research articles (abstracts, submission letters, review letters, and so on).

Genres as Staged, Goal-Oriented Social Process−Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL).

Over the last three decades, systemic functional approaches to the genre have made significant contributions to how the genre is understood and utilized in textual analysis and language education. J. R. Martin, Frances Christie, Bill, Cope and Mary Kalantzis, Gunther Kress, Brian Paltridge, Joan Rothery, and Eija Ventola were influenced in large part by the work of Michael Halliday (Halliday and Hasan) at the University of Sydney and was applied to the genre in particular in the work of J. R. Martin, Frances Christie, Bill, Cope, and Mary Kalantzis, Gunther Kress (Bawarshi & Reff, 2010). Thus, SFL is that language structure is inextricably linked to social function and environment.

Language within a culture is arranged in the manner it serves a social purpose within that culture. Eggins, (1997) admitted that the link between language and its functions in social environments is the focus of SFL. A text may be characterized by systematists in terms of two complementing variables: the immediate situational setting in which it was created (register or context of situation) and the general goal and function of the interaction (genre or context of culture). As a result, 'functional' refers to the job that language conducts in certain settings. The structure or arrangement of language such that it may be utilized to get things done in particular circumstances is referred to as 'systemic'. The 'systems of options' accessible to language users for the manifestation of meaning are referred to as 'systemic' (Christie, 2007). The idea of 'realization' is particularly essential in SFL because it represents the dynamic way in which language realizes social intentions and circumstances as unique linguistic exchanges while also realizing language as specific social acts and meanings (Bawarshi & Reff, 2010).

According to Halliday (1984), situation settings are not independent and distinct but rather frequently recur as "situation types, a collection of stereotyped semiotic and semantic interactions that make up a scenario... of individuals, acts, and events from which the things that are spoken acquire their meaning" (pp. 28-30). He added that this 'clustering of semantic properties according to scenario categories' is referred to as a register (p.68). Register specifies what happens (the 'field'), how players interact (the 'tenor'), and what function language plays (the 'mode') by relating a situation type to certain semantic and lexico-grammatic patterns, as cited in (Bawarshi & Reff, 2010).

Eggins, (1997) argued that the 'field' of discourse, for example, denotes the system of activity inside a given environment, which includes the actors, practices, and conditions. The social links between the participants—their interactions—within the discourse are represented by the 'tenor' of the discourse. The 'mode' of discourse refers to the channel or wavelength of communication (face-to-face, via e-mail, phone, etc.) that participants utilize to carry out their activities and relationships. Each of these environmental elements in SFL has a predictable and systematic link with lexico-grammatical patterns and is used to construct three sorts of meaning: experimental, textual, and interpersonal. However, Halliday's work has served as a foundation for Systemic Functional (also known as 'Sydney School') approaches to the genre, which focus on helping students "learn to exercise the proper language choices relevant to the requirements, functions, or meanings at every time" (Christie,2007). Hasan (1984a) referred to "generic structure potential" as the range of staging options within a genre). Additionally, Paltridge (1997) said that the structure of a text is never genre-defining, because, in typical instances of a genre, it is 'the co-occurrence and interaction of each aspect of discourse structure with other components of interactional and conceptual frames in their

entirety that leads to the recognition of a text as an instance of a genre, not the presence of particular discourse structures alone (p.104).

Systemic Functional Linguists, according to Hyland (2006), described genres in terms of internal language characteristics and functions. Narratives, recounts, arguments, and expositions are examples of lexico-grammatical qualities that are used to classify genres (spoken or written) based on their lexico-grammatical properties (Bawarshi & Reff, 2010).

A comparison of approaches to genre analysis, RGs, ESP and SFL

This brief description of the distinction between the three approaches to genre analysis shows that RGS focuses on the social purpose of a genre. On the other hand, ESP focuses on the moves and discourse structure of a genre, whereas SFL focuses on the grammatical and discourse structure related to the social function of a genre. The three approaches to genre analysis (ESP, SFL and RGS) within linguistic and rhetorical traditions share a common understanding of the genre as being unified in a situation (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010).

Genres, according to (Freedman, 2006:104) connect with texts and contexts through their emphasis on the 'addressee, the context and the occasion'. However, the analytical/pedagogical implications of the three approaches differ from one another as has been discussed earlier. These differences reflect the different ways genres are distinguished, and how they are studied, taught and acquired. ESP share the fundamental view that linguistic features are connected to social context and function. However, SFL and ESP approaches differ in terms of how genres are detected and analysed. SFL detects genre at the level of context of culture, while ESP detects genre within the context defined by discourse communities. On the other side, RGS and ESP

approaches differ in terms of their understanding of genre. That is, ESP views genres as communicative tools within social contexts, and RGS sees genres as sociological concepts which include textual and social ways of knowing.

The pedagogical implications of the three approaches, on the other hand, are vast. RGS, based on Johns 2013, would allow the teaching of a particular genre to link the text with its use in the context of use by explicating the context of the genre that helps to shape and influence its purpose and structure. This allows students to understand and be familiar with the context where the genre occurs. On the other hand, ESP and SFL emphasize the schematic structure, communicative purpose, and form-function correlation of texts.

Conclusion

This paper reviews three principal approaches to genre analysis within linguistic and rhetorical traditions, RGS, ESP and SFL. Each of these approaches has a distinct definition, purpose, concepts and methods of analysis. On the other hand, these approaches have their strengths and capabilities based on the theoretical foundations they are based on. RGS emphasizes understanding the context of a particular text type about its use. ESP, on the other side, focuses on understanding the rhetorical organisation of a text with its grammatical features. On the other hand, SFL aims to understand the generic structure of a text to realise the social function of a particular genre. However, all the approaches share and differ from one another in the way how genre could best be analysed. To reiterate, genre analysis is complex, whether it is analysed from the social and/ or linguistic perspective.

All in all, genre analysts in different settings of genre analysis have continued to debate and find more comprehensive ways of genre analysis that are constantly evolving. It is argued that genre analysts will continue to explore and find more approaches as a result of as a result of the need to uncover genre uses as far as functions in linguistic and social contexts.

References

- Artemeva, Natasha and Aviva Freedman. (2008). *Rhetorical Genre Studies and Beyond*, (eds.) Canada: Inkshed publications.

- Bawarshi, A. S., &Reiff, M. J. 2010.*Genre: An Introduction to History, Theory, Research and Pedagogy.* West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press LLC.

- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). Rethinking genre from a sociocognitive perspective. *Written communication*, 10(4), 475-509.

- Bhatia, V. K. (2002). *Applied genre analysis: Analytical advances and pedagogical procedures*. London: Longman.

- Bhatia, V. K. 1993. *Analyzing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings.* London: Longman.

- Bhatia, V. K., Flowerdew, J., & Jones, R. H. (2008). Approaches to discourse analysis. *Advances in discourse studies*, 1-17.

- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2017). How economists modify propositions. In *Economics and Language* (pp. 153-169). Routledge.

- Eggins, Suzanne, and J.R. Martin. (1997). Genres and Registers of Discourse. *Discourse as Structure and Process*. Ed. Teun Van Dijk. London: Sage.

- Flowerdew, J. (2002). Genre in the classroom: A linguistic approach. *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*, 91-102.

- Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in English language education*. Routledge.

- Freedman, A. (2002). *Uptake, the Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre*.

- Gruber, H. (2013). Genres in Political Discourse: the Case of the 'Inaugural Speech'. *Analysing Genres in Political Communication: Theory and Practice,* 50, 29.

❖ Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

❖ Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic Discourse. Continuum Discourse Series*. London, New York: Continuum.

❖ Hyland, K. 2002. Genre: Language, Context and Literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics.* 22: 113-135.

❖ Lesiak-Bielawska, E. D. (2015). English for specific purposes from a historical perspective. *English for specific purposes world*, 46, 1-23.

❖ Martin-Martin, P. (2003). A genre analysis of English and Spanish research paper abstracts in experimental social sciences. *English for Specific Purpose*, (25-43)

❖ Miller, C. 1984. Genre as Social Action. Genre and the New Rhetoric. Ed. *Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway*. Bristol: Taylor and Francis. 67-77.

❖ Paltridge, B. (1997). *Genre, frames and writing in research settings* (Vol. 45). John Benjamins Publishing.

❖ Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Bloomsbury.

❖ Ramírez, C. G. (2015). English for specific purposes: Brief history and definitions. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, (23).

❖ Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

❖ Yunick, S. 1997. Genres, Registers and Sociolinguistics. *World Englishes*. 13(3): 321-336.