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Introduction
In previously British colonies, such as South Africa, India, Kenya, and Nigeria, the end of colonialism did not end the dominance of English. Indeed, in many post-colonial contexts, although multilingualism is the norm, English, the first language of few, continues to dominate in ‘official’ settings such as government, education, and commerce. In such environments, English for academic purposes (EAP) can play an important role in providing meaningful access to tertiary study for students for whom English is a second language.

This chapter considers the example of South Africa, where the importance of EAP is bolstered by an historically underfunded secondary education system. In this context, school and university literacy practices may be divergent, with students entering university with little prior experience of academic reading and writing. The importance of students’ L1 as a resource in their learning is also a factor to be taken into account, calling into question an ‘English only’ attitude in the EAP classroom. An approach that considers students’ identities as members of their community in addition to being students is influential, suggesting the need to build on students’ prior written and oral literacy practices, rather than viewing them as discontinuous with academic literacy. In South African EAP research, these factors have resulted in the dominance of an ‘academic literacies’ approach, which takes account of students’ social, political, and cultural context. A second approach highlights the importance of genre and language features.

Overview of context and issues
A central aim of EAP is to prepare students for their discipline’s linguistic demands. However, in their introductory editorial to the first volume of JEAP, Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002:2) suggest that in achieving this aim, EAP must take account of the students’ social and cultural context. This is important in any situation, but is a particular focus in this chapter on South Africa, where the social and cultural context of learning in English is particularly salient. In this setting, the influence on EAP of an academic literacies approach, which emphasises the situated nature of literacy and its acquisition, has been prominent.
Of importance too in such contexts is that multilingualism is the norm. Most university students have experienced secondary education in English, which is a first language for a minority. In the same introductory volume of JEAP, Canagarajah (2002) criticises EAP as overly normative with regard to academic writing, and of taking too little account of the complexities of academic literacy acquisition under multilingual circumstances. As Archer (2007) notes, learning academic writing can have implications for identity, if that learning means a rejection of previous literacy practices and values. Canagarajah (2002) views as inadequate a focus on assisting students to acquire the discourse of their academic communities in order to enter these communities, and suggests the need to enable students to reflect on academic discourse, compare it to student’s previous discourses, and critique the power invested in English at the expense of their L1. In the South African context, some researchers (e.g. Madiba 2013), while noting the contribution of EAP in South Africa to opening up access to higher education, caution against marginalising students’ first languages in the EAP classroom.

South Africa: its social, political, and linguistic context

To place this chapter in context, in the following paragraph I briefly summarise South Africa’s troubled recent history. Colonised in 1652 by the Dutch, and by the British in 1806, the country was at that time already populated by a number of San and Bantu-speaking indigenous groups. From 1860 onwards, speakers of Tamil and Hindi entered the country, many as indentured labourers. In 1948, Apartheid was instituted, with its notorious system of racial segregation and white minority rule. A period of ‘separate development’ followed, including separate schooling, universities, residential areas, and even, for the purpose of defining indigenous Africans as foreigners, different ‘homeland states’ for different groups. In 1994, the first elections in which suffrage was universal took place, since which time a start has been made on developing a more just and equal society.

However, despite gradual improvements, Apartheid’s social and educational problems are likely to take some time to solve. During Apartheid, education for groups other than ethnic Europeans was underfunded; schools were overcrowded and under-resourced, teachers were often underqualified, and the medium of instruction was nominally either English or Afrikaans, increasing the learning burden on L1 speakers of other languages (see Table 7.1 for the languages reported by South Africans as their L1 (Census in brief 2012)).

Since 1994, most South Africans still attend relatively poorly resourced schools in which English is the medium of instruction after the first three years. In 1993, the South African constitution made official the languages in Table 7.1. In practice, however, English has grown in dominance in the last 20 years, becoming the main language of education, government, business, and media. This growth in the dominance of English has seen surprisingly little opposition, which a study by Greenfield (2010) put down firstly to a desire to create an egalitarian society which privileges no African language over others; Greenfield’s second reason, endorsed in Thamaga-Chitja and Mbatha (2012), is a view that African languages are undeveloped for academic purposes. There is also the widespread view of schools, parents, and learners that English proficiency will benefit learners in relation to jobs and study, and consequently there is little will to oppose this growing hegemony of English.

Table 7.1 Languages reported by South Africans as their L1 in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Zulu</th>
<th>Xhosa</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>N. Sotho</th>
<th>Tswana</th>
<th>Sotho</th>
<th>Tsonga</th>
<th>Swati</th>
<th>Venda</th>
<th>Ndebele</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, given the theoretical opportunity to choose the medium of instruction, most schools have chosen English. Yet the greater ease of teachers and students with the learners’ L1 has resulted in the L1 being employed in many school classrooms for much spoken use (Probyn et al. 2002), while English is used in textbooks and student writing. The result is that the ability of spoken classroom interaction to support acquisition of written literacy is diminished. Little surprise then that, as Mwanike (2012:215) says, ‘language continues to play the role of privileging access to higher education for some, while curtailing access to higher education for others’. Privileged by this situation are the English-speaking minority, as well as the new middle class, mother-tongue speakers of an African language who are able to attend the more costly, but well-resourced, truly English-medium schools that were reserved for the ethnically European population under Apartheid. Deprived are most South Africans: L1 speakers of an African language, who do not have the means to attend these privileged schools. It is this latter group who have been the focus of most EAP interventions at tertiary level.

Critical issues and topics

I begin this section by discussing the multilingual context of EAP in the South African context. I touch on a key issue in EAP/English for specific purposes (ESP), that of specific vs. generic EAP courses. I then discuss two important EAP traditions in South Africa: one that draws heavily on an academic literacies approach, and another that stresses linguistic features. Finally, I touch on South African work that has been done in testing of readiness to use English for academic purposes. Such testing is generally used to identify incoming students who require support.

Academic literacy in a multilingual context

South Africa is a multilingual country in which everyone knows (to varying degrees) at least two languages and most, particularly those from cities, know several. To illustrate, I include from Mesthrie (2002:13) a statement by a student who grew up in Johannesburg:

My father’s home language was Swazi, and my mother’s home language was Tswana. But as I grew up in a Zulu-speaking area we used mainly Zulu and Swazi at home. But from my mother’s side, I also learnt Tswana well. In my high school I came into contact with lots of Sotho and Tswana students, so I can speak these two languages well. And of course, I know English and Afrikaans.

Despite this widespread multilingualism, in the 20 years since true democracy, many institutions, such as government and education, have become increasingly monolingual. As Makalela and McCabe (2013) note, of the ‘historically white universities’, Afrikaans-medium universities have made the most change towards multilingualism in South Africa by becoming, in line with government policy, dual-medium English-Afrikaans institutions. Historically white English-medium universities have remained monolingual English in practice, as have historically Black universities. Makalela and McCabe (2013) describe the situation at one such university, which is officially monolingual English, despite the students all being L1 speakers of African languages. In this context, EAP courses are widely offered because the English proficiency students have acquired at school and, more to the point, their prior experiences of literacy in general, are regarded as not having prepared them for study in English.
In this multilingual environment, South African universities have instituted language policies that propose a greater role for African languages. This does not mean that any university language policies propose instruction in an African language, but rather there is the recognition that students’ L1s are an important resource for learning. Despite fairly moderate aims, university language policies have been difficult to implement (Masoke-Kadenge & Kadenge 2013; Makalela & McCabe 2013; Stroud & Kerfoot 2013). Evidence of implementation at some institutions include making a course in an African language mandatory for students (Ndimande-Hlongwa et al. 2010), limited simultaneous interpreting of lectures into an African language (van Rooy 2005), and limited provision of multilingual glossaries or dictionaries (Madiba 2013; Carstens 1998).

Madiba (2013) notes widespread codeswitching amongst ESL university students, and goes so far as to suggest that monolingual instruction in either L1 or English would make learning more difficult than drawing on both resources. In classroom discussion, codeswitching can involve use of English words for ideas and concepts, thus aiding discussion of these technical concepts. Greenfield (2010) calls for the deliberate use of more than one language in the classroom to increase understanding and student investment.

Indeed, there is some move in EAP classrooms to encourage use of discussion of concepts in students’ L1 as a first step towards understanding of concepts and writing about them in English (Deyi 2010; Henning & van Rensburg 2002; Paxton 2009). Paxton describes encouraging her students to discuss concepts in their L1, and providing a tutor who shared their L1. During discussion, students uncovered misunderstandings, deepening their conceptual understanding. Paxton sees such discussion between students and mentors such as tutors as a possible resource for developing multilingual glossaries. In Deyi (2010), students were asked to identify the L1 equivalents for concepts and terms. Deyi’s study indicated that students felt that their identities had been affirmed and that the process had been helpful for acquisition of academic and technical terms. Use of the L1 in the EAP classroom and beyond clearly needs further study.

**Generic vs. specific interventions**

In a thoughtful survey of published descriptions of EAP interventions in South Africa, Butler (2013) found that most published research on this topic described specific rather than generic approaches. He found that reasons for selecting a specific approach were authenticity, motivation, genre appropriateness, collaboration between EAP and discipline specialists, and grounding students’ acquisition of disciplinary literacy in prior literacies. The generic model, considerably less frequent in published studies, was selected with claims of transferability.

Goodier and Parkinson (2005) describe a discipline-based course in business studies. The course simulated business settings to teach important pedagogical and workplace genres: case studies, research papers, and reports. Parkinson (2000) describes a genre-based science course which situates learning of a key genre, the laboratory report, in real experiences of measurement, data collection, and analysis. Parkinson et al. (2007) describes the teaching of language features of science genres embedded in a discipline-based course. Similarly, Carstens (2011) used a genre-based approach in a writing programme aimed at senior undergraduate history students.

One EAP model popular at universities of technology (polytechnics) suggests that the teaching of academic writing should be devolved even further into the disciplines so that it becomes the responsibility of disciplinary staff, as they have greater knowledge and insight into the norms, values, and forms of their discipline. In this model, the role of the EAP
professional becomes initial co-teaching with the discipline specialist, ‘making explicit the norms and conventions of disciplines’ (Jacobs 2013:133) that have become taken for granted for the discipline specialist. This trend coincides with the ideal of South African universities as undergoing transformation; in this view, the university must adapt to English as a Second Language (ESL) students (increasingly a majority) to meet them partway in adapting to the university.

I now move on to three EAP traditions in South Africa: literacy-focused, language-focused, and skills-focused. The first two strongly favour a disciplinary/specific approach, while a skills-focused approach favours a general EAP approach.

The socially situated nature of literacy: the academic literacies tradition

The dominant strand in published South African EAP research situates itself in the academic literacies tradition (Lillis and Tuck, this volume; Lillis & Scott, 2007). Drawing on the New Literacy Studies (Street 2003), this approach views literacy practices as embedded in social and cultural context, and students’ prior discourse practices as relevant to their acquisition of disciplinary writing. Lillis and Scott (2007:8) point out that, in the US and the UK, increasing presence at universities of groups who traditionally had little access to tertiary study encouraged debate about the nature of tertiary literacy practices. In South Africa, this change in student demographics has been rapid; it may be measured in the growth in numbers of degrees awarded annually to Black Africans in South Africa over the last 20 years: 8,514 in 1991 compared to 36,970 in 2008 (Dell 2011).

During this time, EAP researchers have come to view problems encountered by ESL tertiary students as related as much to literacy as to language. Indeed, many ESL students experience very different uses and values for literacy at school and at university. This difference is explored in a number of valuable studies. Relying on Gee’s (1990:xvii) view of the classroom as socialising learners not only into ‘ways of using language’ but also into ‘ways of acting and interacting and the display of certain values and attitudes’, Kapp (2004) provides insight into the school practices to which ESL learners are exposed. Although Kapp condemns stereotyping in the literature of schools as teacher dominated and as encouraging rote-learning, the classrooms she describes do not deviate markedly from the stereotype. She found that in English classrooms in such schools, oral communication predominated, first because Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been widely interpreted as an emphasis on the oral mode, and second because of the belief that writing functions merely to record information as a memory aid. She found that classroom discourse focused on what-questions and facts rather than critical judgement or inference.

This school-based attitude to writing results in student difficulty in moving from oral to written mode. Boughey (2000) describes how ESL writers, who based their written practice on oral communication, which needs less context, tended to provide little context for their ideas in writing. Boughey’s informants reported that writing at school was seldom read by teachers who viewed it merely as a means to record information or prove that learning had taken place. She quotes the following from an interview with a student about school writing practices (Boughey 2000:285):

Well, in fact, they used to give us a sort of homework. Maybe you find the teacher doesn’t pay much attention to how to write the homework. They just stand in front of you and ask for the answer to Question 1 and […] he says ‘Mark it right’ or
‘Mark it wrong’ which means that they don’t have the time to look at your writing. They just want to know whether you answered it or you didn’t.

In this environment, no context need be provided because the information will be used in an oral lesson. Boughey (2000) attributes to this school-based literacy a conception of knowledge as a commodity to be learnt and reproduced, rather than developing a critical approach to knowledge. This idea of knowledge of accepted truth discourages recognition of the multiple voices in academic texts, including the writer’s own. Discussing implications for teaching referencing, Boughey (2000) notes that an idea of knowledge as accepted by all makes repeating that knowledge without attribution a reasonable practice.

Kapp’s (2004) study found too that the difficulty in becoming proficient enough in English for university study was increased by peer-stigmatisation of those who spoke English outside the classroom; paradoxically, those who did so were paid most attention by teachers and awarded good grades. Ironically, despite standing out from their peers because of good grades and English proficiency, once students got to university they were regarded as ‘disadvantaged’.

The suggested solutions to this disjunction between school and university literacy practices recognise students’ prior literacy practices, and choose rather to build on these to make school and university practices continuous rather than replace them. Using a case-study approach, Leibowitz (2004) investigated students’ prior literacies to see how they impact academic literacy acquisition. She describes how although few of her participants had access to print literacy before they went to school, her informants relied on a rich oral tradition including oral tales, narratives, and riddles, as well as radio programmes. Texts written by her students bore signs of the influence of church and community discourse. Similarly Paxton’s (2007a) undergraduate students drew on political/activist discourse and traditional Xhosa rhetorical styles. Leibowitz (2004) suggests that academics in the disciplines could build on these prior literacy practices to extend learners’ writing abilities in the direction of academic discourse.

Aligned to this approach, a valuable study by Archer (2008) sought to build on and extend students’ ‘discourses’ of engineering or ways of talking, writing about, and valuing engineering. Students, who viewed engineering as functioning to solve social ills through technological development, wrote proposals for development of a rural village, similar to the villages in which many students had grown up. Placing a high value on students’ knowledge of underdeveloped communities, Archer sought to enable her students to make links between their own experience and engineering discourse practices, which Archer characterises as prizing a problem-based approach in which solutions are judged against a set of stated criteria. Archer notes the difficulties experienced by students in negotiating authorial identity, stemming from the existence within their writing of the norms of impersonal academic writing side by side with a sense of themselves as active agents in their planned development. The students’ identities as engineers who will design solutions to problems of development coexisted with their identities as previous residents of a rural village. The assignment enabled students to make links between knowledge from sources and their own experience.

Issues of identity in academic writing have been of interest to scholars in this tradition. Starfield (2002) drew on multiple data sources including observation, interviews, and written documents to investigate the literacy practices and identity construction of students who succeeded or failed to succeed on a sociology course. She explores how one middle-class student succeeded in projecting an authoritative identity as a writer by drawing on prior knowledge of text and intertextuality to address the assignment question, write coherently,
and argue well, gaining a good grade despite a lack of references. In contrast, another student, constructed by himself and the institution as a ‘disadvantaged second language speaker’, did not have the same knowledge and prior experience of academic writing; he failed to recognise intertextual references in the assignment question, and misinterpreted it. He also failed to develop an authoritative ‘voice’ in his writing, employing patchwriting and avoided expressing his own opinion. Starfield’s study makes it clear that this student’s problems are more closely related to prior knowledge of literacy practices than to knowledge of language.

As Starfield (2002) implies, labels such as ‘disadvantaged’ and ‘second language speaker’ are disempowering as well as overly essentialist. Thesen (1997) found that a student thus labelled by the institution was the most literate individual in the village from which she had come. Students in her study distanced themselves from these labels, characterising themselves instead in political terms as ‘we as Black people’. De Kadt and Mathonsi (2003) explored the difficulties of developing an academic voice in English, a second language, with some students consciously ‘shouting out to be seen as African’ (2003:95), using their voice to show bias towards ‘the poor and less fortunate’.

That academic voice can sometimes function in opposition to own voice or expression of an African identity is explored by McKenna (2004). Lecturing staff and student interviewees in her study were shown two responses to the question ‘Name and discuss the three forms of taxation’. One response, which named and compared the forms of taxation, was framed in the essayist, ‘to the point’ mould. The second not only named the three forms of taxation, but illustrated and evaluated each type by reference to its effect on the poor. The lecturers interviewed focused on the ways in which this answer deviated from the point, and regarded it as ‘jumbled […] propaganda grafted onto the basic economic ideas’ (2004:275). In contrast, the students interviewed, while recognising it as less likely than the first to be highly graded, regarded the second answer as a better one, noting that it had been ‘written by someone who “has her voice” and is “saying what she feels is right”’ (2004:275).

Preparing students for the linguistic demands of their discipline

A second tradition of South African EAP scholarship, more directly in the ESP/EAP tradition, has focused on preparing students to use their disciplines’ specialised language. Although I consider the studies in this section for their focus on disciplinary language, it should not be thought that these studies give no attention to context, including students’ prior literacy practices. However, their primary focus is on describing the literacy that students need to acquire to be integrated into their disciplines, or ways to mediate this acquisition. Thus studies in this tradition give greater attention than do those in the academic literacy tradition to the context and norms of the disciplines that students are entering: disciplinary rather than social context is emphasised.

One example is a study of the lab session in undergraduate chemistry and physics by Parkinson and Adendorff (1997) who used multiple methods including observation, interviews, analysis of participant interaction as well as textual analysis to examine the values reflected in this key literacy event in science. This study identified two kinds of lab manual, which had linguistic differences, and also reflected different beliefs about undergraduate science: a ‘cookbook’ manual in chemistry used imperatives to encourage students to act in following lab procedures, and an ‘investigative’ lab manual in physics encouraged learning to think, predict, and draw inferences.

Wyrley-Birch (2010) similarly investigated disciplinary language and values reflected in trainee radiotherapists’ communication with three audiences: patients, radiotherapists,
and other health professionals. Ability to negotiate these three registers has implications for the radiotherapists’ developing professional identity. She shows that the lexis that the radiotherapists used ranged from formal to informal with all three audiences. For example, the same device may be referred to as an ‘immobilisation device’ (formal academic term used with other health professionals), an ‘impression’ (formal technical term used with other radiotherapists), a ‘cast’ (informal technical term), and a ‘mask’ (polite layperson’s term). Professional terms may also be used between colleagues to avoid patients understanding them.

Bangeni (2013) has a dual focus on linguistic features and students’ identity development within the discipline. The study sought to describe the three move structure (identify, analyse, and evaluate) of the written case analysis genre in marketing. The genre is complicated for writers by the roles they must take up: the professional roles of problem-solver and manager, as well as the role of knower/student of the discipline addressing the lecturer as audience.

A study of legal language by Ngwenya (2006) combines an awareness of context with a focus on unpacking the linguistic features of law discourse. Included are Latin terminology, sub-technical legal words (such as ‘action’, meaning ‘lawsuit’), identifying the agents of nominalisation, identifying subject, verb, and object of long sentences, and changing between active and passive. Ngwenya combines this linguistic focus with critical language awareness to assist students in unpacking the power relations in legal texts.

Focusing on economics textbooks in use at a South African university, Paxton (2007b) found that these were not a good model for literacy practices in economics, because the textbooks are ‘single-voiced’, presenting ideas as established fact and thus discouraging critical reading. Similarly, Jackson, Meyer and Parkinson (2006) found a mismatch between the reading and writing assigned to science students. The reading was largely from textbooks, while the writing was largely lab reports; these are not well modelled by textbook writing, which rather than investigating hypotheses, treats information as accepted knowledge.

In a series of studies on the use of a process approach to teach writing, Kasanga (2004) considered attitudes to and use of peer-reviewing amongst students at an ‘historically Black’ institution. She found that despite lack of exposure to process writing at school, students willingly employed and benefited from peer-reviewing, although they expressed a preference for teacher feedback.

Klos (2012) describes an approach to teaching attention to organisation in reading and writing to pharmacy undergraduates. Making a link with prior knowledge and home-based practices of use of traditional medicines, she based this teaching on texts related to indigenous healing therapies.

In another study that focused on language features, Pretorius (2006) found that ESL health science students who were better able to understand logical connections in information linked by illustrative, causal, and adversative logical connectors, did better academically. In response to this, she designed reading activities that target logical relations by, for example, supporting students in identifying and recognising words that signal a causal relation, and providing practice in constructing causal relations.

Ellery (2008) describes tutorials to help geography students avoid plagiarism. In interviews with students, it became clear that reasons for plagiarism included being unsure of when and how a reference must be cited, and concern over making information less factual. Angélil-Carter’s insightful study (2000) of student (mis)use of the words and ideas of their sources confirms that rather than being academic dishonesty, plagiarism usually reflects ‘lack of clarity about the concept of plagiarism itself’; she also found ‘a lack of clear policy and pedagogy surrounding the issue’ (2000:2). Students may plagiarise because they are ‘trying
on’ a new literacy practice which is initially foreign to them. As with learning a new language, this often involves reproducing chunks such as ideas, wordings, or text organisation. In this context, the student writer lacks authority with respect to the published text, and has difficulty developing or expressing authorial voice.

Corpora of student writing have been employed in a few studies. Parkinson (2011) compared the language features used to construct arguments in research article discussion sections to those used by undergraduate science students in the discussion sections of their lab reports. In a 2013 study, working with the same corpus of undergraduate science writing, Parkinson investigated student use of reporting verbs, and found that students’ language choices reflect conversational norms, as well as beginning to share academic values regarding objectivity and evidence.

**Skill-based approaches**

Both the EAP traditions I discuss above take account of context: the academic literacies tradition considers social context, while EAP aiming to prepare students for the linguistic demands of their discipline takes account of the disciplinary context. However, a skills-based approach to EAP focuses on the behaviour and cognitive abilities of the learner, rather than on the context. The word ‘skills’ refers variously to ‘study skills’, such as referencing skills and library skills, or it can refer to the ‘four language skills’: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Both are associated with a view of reading and writing as dependent on learner ability, as context-free and as easily transferable between contexts. Despite the dominance of an academic literacies approach in published South African research, an analysis by Boughey (2013) of abstracts for a South African language teaching conference found that abstracts in the academic literacies tradition were a minority, and that abstracts reflecting a skills-based framework were more frequent. This is suggested by phrases such as ‘language and study skills’, ‘communication skills’, and ‘academic reading and writing…skills’ (Boughey 2013:33). This curious finding may indicate that those employing a skills approach are less likely to publish. Indeed, Boughey (2013) notes that the common marginalisation of EAP professionals and that lack of tenure does not encourage research or vision of how best to approach EAP teaching.

Notwithstanding Boughey’s claim, I found little published work in the skills framework. Kilfoil (1998) is an early example of a course emphasising study skills, and more recently McCabe (2011), at an ‘historically Black’ institution, justifies use of a ‘course which includes basic study skills and the four basic language skills’ (2011:60) by reference to a context in which students come from a wide spectrum of disciplines, and have ‘generally low English proficiency’ (2011:54). Butler and van Dyk (2004) too describe an EAP course for engineering students that is distinctly in the skills-based mould.

**Testing of proficiency in academic language**

Because of inequities in the education system both before and after Apartheid, universities have been eager to identify entrants with potential to succeed at university although they may not have achieved the requisite school grades. This ‘potential’ is difficult to measure, and in two widely used tests it is identified with academic literacy. Cliff and Hanslo (2009) describe the development of one such test while another has been developed by Weideman and colleagues. For reasons of equity, Van Slik and Weideman (2009) express the hope that their test will not be used to exclude entrants who do not perform at the required level,
but rather to identify those in need of support. Weideman (2008) also suggests that items on such tests must be aligned with the language instruction that follows them. However, this may not be wise if there is the disjuncture between school-based literacy practices and university practices described above. Instead, it seems more reasonable to test for facility with less specific literacy practices, and to employ the EAP intervention to support acquisition of disciplinary practices within the university.

**Main research methods**

The preferred research methods of those working in the academic literacies tradition are ethnographic ones, and likely, within the same study, to include multiple sources of data. For example Paxton (2007b), uses rich triangulation of data sources, including interviews with students about their writing, textual analysis of disciplinary academic texts, and analysis of student writing. Paxton (2009) draws on recordings of classroom interaction, as well as interviews with students and their tutor. Paxton (2012) allowed students to interpret their own writing, and she used classroom observation as well as students’ written literacy histories.

To investigate the features of academic writing in the disciplines, textual analysis and corpus methods have also been used. For example, Parkinson (2013) used corpus methods to compare use of reporting verbs and the agents of these verbs in learner writing and in professional writing. Goodier (2008) compared case reports written by student and professional radiographers, using move analysis.

**Future directions**

The change in student demographics at South African universities in the last two decades has necessitated adaptation by universities to the needs of ‘non-traditional’ students, rather than catering only to students whose prior literacy experiences mesh with expected university literacy practices. EAP researchers have played an important role in uncovering prior student literacies and how these mesh, or fail to mesh, with university expectations. EAP professionals have not only worked with students to assist them in acquiring the practices of their disciplines, but have worked with discipline specialists to assist them in adjusting their practices to their students. This attention to the socially situated nature of literacy and to issues of identity has been an important contribution to the transformation of higher education in South Africa.

However, text and pedagogy have been underemphasised in many of these important contributions. Indeed, a weakness of the academic literacies model, as Wingate points out, has been its failure to ‘come up with an alternative writing pedagogy’ (2012:28). Lately, however, academic literacy scholars have begun to call for a dual emphasis on text and context. For example, while viewing favourably a move away from text towards practice as the primary focus in academic literacy research, Lillis and Scott (2007:21) warn against neglecting focus on detailed analysis of texts. Paxton (2012) too recommends combining text analysis with ethnographic methods that allow insight into context. This dual focus has usually been neglected by South African researchers however, with heavy emphasis either on the context or on text.

EAP research in South Africa, both research and practice, would benefit from reliance on both the strong tradition of exploring social context, and the tradition of textual analysis and the ways such analysis can be used to benefit EAP students in the classroom. Archer (2008) is such a study: it situates student acquisition of an important disciplinary
genre within an academic literacies framework that takes account of prior literacies, and deliberately facilitates their extension and connection to disciplinary ones. Another example is Paxton’s (2007b) critique of first year economics textbooks: while placed firmly within an academic literacies framework, it provides a useful discussion of how the author used texts other than the textbook to develop students as critical readers with a heightened sense of the intertextuality of all texts. Looking to the future, further development is needed of ways to avoid marginalisation of students’ first language both inside and outside in the EAP classroom (Madiba 2013).
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