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SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS AND EAP

Susan Hood

Introduction

English for academic purposes (EAP) can be conceived as a field of academic knowledge (what constitutes academic English) and a field of practice (the teaching and learning of academic English). Both fields are addressed in this chapter from the perspective of systemic functional linguistics (SFL), a social semiotic theory of language. This is primarily a linguistic take on EAP, although studies that explore other semiotic systems such as body language and image are also noted. In contributions to practice, the main focus is on tertiary contexts and transitions towards that sphere. (Humphrey, this volume, takes a school focus on EAP.) In discussing contributions from SFL, a social semiotic toolkit for undertaking research and for informing teaching of EAP emerges, as do insights into key concerns for the field including the significance of disciplinary specialization, issues of stance and identity, and the management of diverse and changing technologies in pedagogic interactions.

What does it mean to take an SFL perspective on EAP?

A brief account of some relevant principles of SFL theory is necessary, as these constitute the lenses through which EAP is viewed. Core to an SFL gaze is an understanding that ‘[l]anguage is as it is because of the functions it has evolved to serve in people’s lives’ (Halliday 1978, pp.3–4). Form and meaning are not differentiated. Rather, language is theorized as meaning, and meaning lies in relations within system networks of choices such that what we say/write (image/design, and so on) means in relation to what we could have said/written/etc. but did not. Meaning is hence a relational concept: it is valeur in Hjelmslev’s terms (Hjelmslev 1961).

Systems of valeur function across three strata of language: as discourse semantics (Martin 1992; Martin & Rose 2007), lexico-grammar (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004) and phonology/graphology (Halliday & Greaves 2008). All strata contribute to our potential to mean in language, and the systems that structure valeur are organized metafunctionally, as ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning. A metafunctional perspective on meaning reflects the fundamental dimensions of human interaction: ways in which we construe the world as events, entities and circumstances (ideationally); ways in which we interact with others in the expression of relationships and values (interpersonally); and ways in which we organize...
our messages to make sense to others in the context of our interactions (textually). The intrinsic functionality of language as ideational, interpersonal and textual relates to the extrinsic functionality of context as register and its variables of field, tenor and mode. Genre in SFL constitutes a more abstracted stratum of context, ‘above’ register. It is realized in the recurring configurations of field, tenor and mode meanings that evolve in a culture (Martin 1992; Martin & Rose 2008).

The context of EAP

What does EAP look like from the vantage point of field, tenor and mode, and genre? What dimensions of knowledge and practice are explored and what issues for EAP are thrown into relief?

Context as field in SFL orients us to the ‘kinds of activities that are undertaken, and how participants in these activities are described, how they are classified and what they are composed of’. In other words, ‘how our experience of “reality” – material and symbolic reality – is construed in discourse’ (Martin & Rose 2003, p.66). In any specific context, activities are ‘oriented to some global institutional purpose, whether this is a local domestic institution such as family or community, or a broader societal institution such as … academia’ (Martin & Rose 2008, pp.3–4). In the discourses of EAP, field foregrounds issues of content and knowledge. It is implicated in understanding difference in discourses of science, social science and the humanities, in understanding the construction of knowledge within disciplines, the content of specific subjects, or topics of academic papers. Field connects to the challenges students encounter in engaging with new academic ways of seeing and presenting ‘reality’ within disciplinary environments.

Context as tenor constitutes complex relations of power and solidarity that are played out in patterns of interpersonal meaning in discourse, for example, in expressions of attitude, speech function roles taken up in negotiation of meanings, and ways in which space is given (or not) to alternate propositions (see Halliday & Mathiessen 2004 on mood and modality; Martin & White 2005 on appraisal; Martin & Rose 2007 on exchange structure and negotiation).

In academic interactions, managing the relations of tenor complements the management of field. Alongside learning relevant ways of presenting knowledge, novice academics in any intellectual field learn the values intrinsic to that field, the control of resources for evaluating other contributions to knowledge, for positioning and persuading others, and for the development of repertoires of personae for shifting amongst diverse kinds of interactions (Hood 2010, 2012; Coffin 2003; Lander 2014, 2015). In planning pedagogic interventions in EAP, considerations of disciplinary difference must therefore account not only for content, but for values and the gaze of the legitimate knower: all realized in language (Hood 2010, 2015; Maton 2014; Coffin & Donohue 2014).

Context as mode has to do with the ways in which interactions are mediated, impacting on potential feedback and enabling the relative distancing of discourse from material reality. It orients us to patterns of textual meaning in language, to the ways certain meanings are made salient and to how participants are tracked in the flow of meaning. Mode and its realization in language are explained and exemplified in Halliday and Matthiessen (2004 on grammatical systems of Theme–Rheme and Given–New), and Martin and Rose (2007 on discourse systems of periodicity and identification). The lens of mode on EAP reveals how academic texts are textured to enable writers to guide readers towards the knowledge and values espoused. Contributions to Forey and Thompson (2009) explore, for example,
the ways in which clause level and discourse level Theme is sensitive to field (discipline), tenor (orientation to readership) and genre (story or explanatory texts). Hood (2006, 2009) shows how higher-level Theme choices enable writers to establish stance while maintaining ‘objectivity’ to the field (see also Ravelli 2004).

The textual lens of SFL also reveals the affordances and constraints on meaning of different technologies and modalities of teaching/learning EAP. SFL allows for the integration of choices across different semiotic systems. Building on theorizations of image (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996/2005), gesture (Martinec 2004) and other systems, multimodal research has expanded rapidly, often in educational contexts (Humphrey, this volume). Studies of teacher body language in EAP show, for example, its significance in coordinating participants and signaling salience (textual meaning), and in invoking attitude and negotiating meaning (interpersonal meaning) (Hood 2011b). Hood and Lander (in press) show ways in which meaning potential changes from live lecture to voiced-over slides online. Studies of multimodality in EAP take on some urgency with rapid changes in technologies and modes of communication in higher education.

Genre in SFL (Martin 1992) is a more abstracted level of context from register, defined as culturally evolved ‘configuration of meanings, realized through language and attendant modalities’ (Martin & Rose 2008, p.20). Users of English for academic purposes are acculturated via visible or invisible pedagogic practices into the high-stakes genres defining their different disciplinary cultures. The term ‘genre’ is used in a number of theories with relevance to EAP. It necessarily means something different in each. In SFL, it is a technical term for cultural configurations of field, tenor and mode meanings, realized in language and attendant modalities. It does not refer to meanings intuited about texts, or to everyday understandings of discourse shared amongst social groups. Comparative accounts of the meaning of genre from an SFL perspective are found in Martin (2014), Hood (2010) and Coffin and Donohue (2014).

The systemic perspective on meaning in SFL (as choice in system) provides researchers, teachers and learners of EAP with a framework for making visible meaning choices in texts in ways that have relevance beyond the instance.

**SFL contributions to EAP framed by field**

Field as a disciplinary domain proves a useful organizing framework for SFL contributions to EAP as studies frequently refer to specific intellectual fields. However, particular contributions so-framed might foreground other contextual variables and linguistic realizations; their focus may also be on aspects of tenor, mode or genre.

**Field as science**

Historically, contributions to the language of science owe much to foundational studies of Halliday. He explores the evolution of scientific language from Chaucer to Newton to late twentieth-century science texts (Halliday and Martin 1993). He describes and explains the evolution of ‘a typical syndrome of grammatical features … of scientific English’, involving nominalization and causal relations that enable ‘the clause to function effectively in constructing knowledge and value’ (Halliday 1990/2002, pp.169–173). Characteristics of scientific discourse are further explored in Martin and Veel’s (1998) Reading Science. A number of chapters focus on technicality and how it is built both in the evolution of the field and in the flow of scientific text. Technicality, derived initially from commonsense congruent
representations of the world, comes to condense and distil scientific knowledge so that it can enter into relations with other technicalities, continuing the process of knowledge-building in taxonomies of classification and composition. For a concise account of technical discourse in the context of EAP, see also Woodward-Kron (2008).

Studies of science discourse also highlight the critical role of grammatical metaphor. This refers to shifts in the congruent relationship of meaning and structural element. For example, the meaning of process may be realized congruently in the structure of verbal groups, as italicized in ‘the body regulates the rate in which red blood cells are produced’, or metaphorically in nominal groups, as italicized in ‘regulation of the rate of blood cell production relies on …’ (see Halliday & Martin 1993). Grammatical metaphor enables meanings of clauses to be compacted to manage the textual flow of discourse, so that the compacted meaning can enter into new relationships, as illustrated above.

All metafunctions can be implicated in grammatical metaphor. Examples above constitute experiential metaphor (representations of processes as participants), but logical metaphor is also a critical resource for managing causality in science (Halliday 1993). Rose (1998, p.240) illustrates the progressive development of causality in relation to both the external logic of things happening in the world (1), and the internal logic of text (2):

(1) a happens; so x happens > because a happens, x happens > that a happens causes x to happen > happening a causes happening x > happening a is the cause of happening x.

(2) a happens; so we know x happens > because a happens, we know x happens > that a happens proves x to happen > happening a proves happening x > happening a is the proof of happening x.

Grammatical metaphor opens up meaning potential for construing the world in un-commonsense ways, and is, thus, key to building academic knowledge in all disciplines. From science it migrated to other domains of academic knowledge where it fulfills the same function of compacting meanings to build knowledge upon knowledge. It associates strongly with modes of interaction and connects directly to pedagogic contexts of EAP (see Schleppegrell 2004; Ventola 1996). Lemke’s (1990) Talking Science considers the role of spoken language into the apprenticeship of students into the field of science.

Studies of science discourse have extended across different disciplines, including physical geography (van Leeuwen & Humphrey 1996; Hewings 2004), biology (Schleppegrell 2004; Humphrey & Hao 2013) and mathematics (O’Halloran 2005). As-yet unpublished research is also emerging on the progressive role of mathematics in physics education.

The teaching of scientific English has been the focus of a number of major SFL studies. In the mid-1990s, science constituted one region of knowledge (along with English and history) in the Write it Right project in Australia (Veel 2006). The study tracked scientific apprenticeship and increasing specialization across secondary school, undergraduate and postgraduate levels of study. Findings are published for teachers and teacher educators of scientific English in Korner, McInnes & Rose (2007).

A more recent study analyzed undergraduate writing in biology (and applied linguistics) in Hong Kong as the basis for designing an online tutoring program to support assignment writing (e.g. Humphrey et al. 2010). A study of classroom discourse and knowledge building in secondary school biology (and history) in Australia (Martin & Maton 2013; Humphrey, this volume) marks the beginning of a rich new vein of SFL research in academic English.
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involving interdisciplinary collaboration of SFL with the sociology of education in Legitimation Code Theory (LCT) (Maton 2014). One key finding relevant to tertiary EAP is the need for teachers not only to unpack the technicality and grammatical metaphor of textbooks and readings, but, critically, to repack them. In other words, if we analogize or explain technical meanings into everyday language, we cannot abandon students there. We need to guide them back into using the specialized knowledge and language of their disciplines. The movement between commonsense and academic ways of meaning is referred to as the ‘semantic wave’, a heuristic that has been applied in both secondary and tertiary EAP programs (Coffin & Donohue 2014; Maton, Hood & Shay 2016; Matruglio, Maton & Martin 2013). A second complementary heuristic emerging from the study is the ‘power trilogy’: power words (technicality), power grammar (nominalization and grammatical metaphor) and power composition (the preview–body–consolidation organization of written texts) (Martin & Maton 2013). The challenges in collaborative research across disciplines should not be underestimated, but conversations between SFL and LCT continue to prove highly productive in educational contexts (Maton, Hood & Shay 2016), and are an exciting front of research in EAP.

An appreciation of the genres for doing and writing science is a feature of much SFL research in EAP. Martin and Rose (2008) introduce and model core genres for science as report, explanation and procedural recount. In Veel (2006), the configurations and sequences of genres in apprenticing students into the field are explored. Veel also illustrates the nature and function of different explanation genres found in science texts. Humphrey and Hao (2013) focus on genres that undergraduate students write in biology.

We commonly associate the language of science with impersonality and objectivity, a consequence of the ‘thingification’ of the world (Martin 2007, p.45), yet interpersonal meaning is always present. Causation in science, for example, fuses cause with modality of probability or obligation (as in indicates, proves) (Martin 2007, p.60). Hood (2010) draws on appraisal in SFL to identify how science (and social science) allows for explicit attitude in representing objects of study, but prefers implicit evaluations of contributions to knowledge. (Interpersonal meaning is discussed further later in the chapter.) Nonetheless, as Wignell (2007, p.299) notes, ‘science involves trying to understand the “world” by looking at it through a technical framework’, so in terms of register, we can say that ‘science foregrounds field’.

**Field as the humanities**

A focus on science discourse frequently references a complementarity with humanities discourse. A comparative focus is taken in Martin (1993, 2007) and Wignell (1998, 2007). From studies such as these, more detailed linguistic pictures emerge of how and why different academic discourses draw differently from the meaning potential of the language; that is, how they instantiate differently from systems of lexico-grammar, discourse semantics, register and genre. Where science foregrounds technicality in building specialized knowledge, the humanities rely dominantly on resources of abstraction to understand and interpret the world. Wignell (1998, p.301) explains, ‘[p]ut simply, abstraction involves moving from an instance or collection of instances, through generalisation to abstract interpretation. … We shift from “story” to what the “story” means’. Abstraction constitutes ‘a general resource for realizing semiotic distance’, or distance from material action. So where science discourse is seen to foreground the register as field, humanities discourse is seen to foreground register as mode.
History

History has been a dominant area of SFL research in the humanities. Early studies in Eggins, Wignell and Martin (1987) are enhanced with contributions from Martin (2002), Martin and Wodak (2003) and Coffin (2000, 2003, 2006). Coffin (2003) provides a rich account of genres in history along with realizations of time, cause and evaluation. Martin (2003, 2007) also provides detailed analyses and explanations of how time and cause are realized, and shows the critical role of abstraction in realizing both. With respect to time, abstraction enables the packing up of time, shifting gaze from the unfolding of events as they happened (and then… and then…), to periods of time (the 1800s, the post-9/11 era), which, as they accrue density of meaning, begin to function as a kind of technicality (the renaissance, modernity, post-colonialism).

With respect to cause, Martin (2007, p.46) points to a crucial characteristic of history discourses, namely ‘their focus on explaining what happened over time, using cause in the clause to do so’. Congruent causal relations in English are managed by conjunctions between clauses (so, because, therefore). In the abstracted and grammatically metaphoric discourses of history, relations of cause are managed in other ways:

Inside the clause … the nominal (cause, reason, basis, source, motive, etc.), prepositional (due to, owing to, because of … etc.) and most importantly an indefinite array of verbal resources that allow for the subtle nuancing of causal relations in the function of interpretation.

(Martin 2007, p.46, original emphasis)

Martin (2007, p.46) illustrates the interpretive role of causal processes in:

• Their stand against injustice, however, attracted national publicity for Aboriginal land rights grievances.
• [It] … sparked a campaign for human rights, including land rights by many Aboriginal people.

He notes that, while “cause in the clause” is also an important motif in science discourse … scientists prefer a simple model of cause and effect; they are not interested in proliferating different kinds of cause’ (2007, p.47).

Martin (2007, p.49) also attends to differences within the realm of history discourse, noting how kinds of history are distinguished by ‘what they are used to explain’. For example;

[m]odernist history nominalizes activity and gets the resulting abstractions acting on one another; Marxist history takes this step but also technicalizes abstractions, drawing on social science to do so; post-colonial history technicalizes the abstractions as discourse, drawing an alternate ‘critical’ canon. The concern for agency remains: what differs is what ‘acts’ – modernist abstractions, Marxist technicality or critical discourse.

(Martin 2007, p.49)

Differences in discourses of history, and the humanities more broadly, are revealed in analyses of high-stakes student writing in senior secondary subjects, including modern and
ancient history (Matruglio 2014, 2010). The study identifies the genre profiles and reveals the ways in which the values of the humanities are distributed across subjects.

Interpersonal meaning is explored in history through appraisal in Coffin (1997, 2003, 2006). Coffin notes ‘the linguistic tools for evaluating and re-evaluating events in order to give new and different meanings to the past’ (2003, p.220), and how writer choices in appraisal construe different kinds of writer identity. She identifies historian voices of: recorder (more ‘objective’, no judgment); interpreter (judgment restricted to social esteem, luck, ability, courage); and adjudicator (more ‘subjective’, judgment including social sanction, im/moral, un/ethical) (Coffin 1997; Martin 2003, pp.35–36).

While dominantly relying on abstraction, history has a ‘fuzzy’ technicality, or what Martin refers to as ‘flexitech’ (Matruglio, Maton & Martin 2013, p.45), where taxonomic relations remain relatively shallow and open as in, for example, the ‘isms’ of nationalism, socialism, communism, capitalism and so on. Such flexitech is a feature of humanities discourse more broadly applying, for example, to terms such as ‘agency’ or ‘performativity’ in cultural studies.

As Martin (2003, p.22) notes, in history ‘obviously things happen – events unfold materially in the world. But it is language that makes history’. The same can of course be said for other fields of the humanities, and beyond.

Other fields in the humanities

From the 1970s onwards, SFL scholars have also turned their attention to literary studies. Contributions include Halliday (1990/2002), Hasan (2015) and Lukin and Webster (2005) amongst many others. Film studies provides one of the case studies of EAP in action in Coffin and Donohue (2014), and discourses of cultural studies are a recent focus of SFL research. For contrastive accounts of cultural studies and social science disciplines (applied linguistics, organizational studies), see Hood (2007, 2011a, 2016). For SFL studies of the evolving discourses of subject English in secondary school, see Humphrey (this volume).

Genre in the humanities

The identification of genres in humanities disciplines is a feature of many contributions noted above. Genres of history are explored extensively in Coffin (2006), Martin and Rose (2008), Matruglio (2014, 2010) and Martin (2007). System networks of agnate genres of history are developed in Martin and Rose (2008, p.130), illustrating a progression from more commonsense to more un-commonsense. The deployment of story genres in research writing in the humanities and social sciences is explored in Hood (2016). Their academic functions are revealed with reference to location, integration, range and kind of story.

Field as social science

An SFL perspective on the social sciences owes much to the work of Wignell (1998, 2007). Wignell took both a diachronic perspective, tracing the evolution of the discourse from the mid-seventeenth century to the early twentieth century, and a synchronic perspective, analyzing sample texts from the academic disciplines of sociology, economics and political science. Wignell identifies why and how social science emerges as ‘a kind of synthesis’ of science and the humanities, originating as it did in the humanities with science added later (2007, p.298). Where science technicalizes meaning from the congruent material world, ‘what social science does … is to make the abstract technical’. It ‘takes as its starting point an
abstract construal of experiences and reconstrues that initial abstraction technically’ (2007, p.298). In social science, we find a tension between the technical and the abstract, in other words between field and mode, presenting particular challenges for novice writers. The challenge of technicality in science is compounded with the challenges of abstraction in the humanities.

Relatively less attention has been paid to this domain in SFL studies, with some exceptions (e.g. Lewin, Fine & Young 2001). However, given the hybrid nature of the discourse, there are implications for learning the language of social sciences from both the sciences and humanities. SFL studies of disciplines of social science include sociology, economics and political science (Wignell 2007), education (Martin & Maton 2013), health studies and social work (Coffin & Donohue 2014; Lander 2014, 2015) and applied linguistics (Hood 2007).

Other recent interdisciplinary studies employing SFL and LCT, especially the dimension of specialization in LCT (Maton 2014), have identified the hybridity in discourses of social science with respect to the referencing of sources (Hood 2011a), locating them between the foregrounding of knowledge over knowers of the sciences, and knowers over knowledge in the humanities. Tensions between knowledge and knowers are also played out in the functions of story genres in ethnographic accounts from the humanities and social sciences (Hood 2016).

**Framing EAP as tenor**

The framing of EAP as field is of course just one way to present SFL contributions. Tenor is another. While some contributions discussed above refer to interpersonal meaning, further attention is warranted, given the many ways in which the system of appraisal in SFL has been deployed in research and teaching of academic language. Appraisal models resources of evaluation at the discourse semantic level of language. It comprises three sub-systems: attitude, graduation and engagement (see Martin & White 2005; Hood & Martin 2007; Hood 2010, for detailed explanations). Appraisal has provided a powerful linguistic framework for explaining how academic writers (novice and expert) strategically position and persuade their readership, especially in written discourse. SFL studies have demonstrated the significance of managing evaluative resources for success in undergraduate writing (Lee 2010a, 2010b). They have shown how writers use different resources when evaluating their object of study and when evaluating other research (Hood 2010, 2012), establishing different relationships with readers in each case. Graduation resources enable implicit rather than explicit evaluation and are a critical means by which academic writers manage the dual demands of ‘objectivity’ and critique when reporting on other contributions to knowledge (Hood 2010, 2012; Hood & Martin 2007).

**Identity and affiliation**

A number of dimensions of SFL theory that have not as yet been widely applied in research are now gaining attention. The complementary hierarchies of instantiation and individuation, for example, are opening space for exploring the uses and users of language (Martin 2010). *Instantiation* is the relation between the generalized meaning potential of the system of language and the meanings instantiated in text. It is a cline of generality. The analogy offered by Halliday is the relation of climate to weather, where climate is the system and weather the instance. This analogy usefully highlights the dynamism in language with each instance adjusting probabilities in the system in some way. The hierarchy of *individuation* focuses on
the distribution of the reservoir of meaning potential in language across cultures and social groupings, to the repertoire of individuals. The cline of individuation refers to distribution in its downward trajectory and to affiliation in its upward trajectory. Where instantiation foregrounds uses of language, individuation foregrounds users.

The interaction of these two dimensions opens space for exploring identity and affiliation (Knight 2010). First, texts instantiate both ideational and interpersonal meaning; particular evaluative meanings are said to couple with the particular entities and events they evaluate. These couplings are the basis for negotiation of solidarity and community. To the extent that couplings are shared they form bonds of affiliation (Knight 2010). Complexes of shared bonds form bond networks, strengthening the communities of affiliation so engendered.

‘The coupling of knowledge and value is an important dimension for any field’ (Martin 2007, p.56), and negotiating bonds of affiliation is highly relevant to notions of disciplinary identity, functioning to establish status as the right kind of knower. Hao and Humphrey (2012) apply affiliation in analyzing writer identity in published biological research. For further accounts, see Bednarek and Martin (2010).

The relationship of language system to text instance is relevant in all academic knowledge practices. Fundamental to the construction of academic knowledge is the reformulation or re-instantiation of meanings from one textual/temporal location into another. On long wavelengths of centuries, this shapes the evolution of discourses of science and the humanities; on short wavelengths of moments, a single sentence is edited in a paper. All metafunctions are implicated in such reformulations. The system–instance relation is illustrated in the pedagogic task of summary writing in Hood (2008). While frequently presented as involving ‘the creation of a shorter text in your own words’, the task is shown to require writers to go beyond the source text to reclaim meaning potential from higher levels of generality in the system, from higher up the cline of instantiation, and then to re-instantiate those more generalized meanings into specific new wordings. Without access to the more generalized meanings, students cannot succeed. The ever-present threat of plagiarism amongst novice writers is in part an issue of appropriately managing the re/instantiation of meanings.

Modes, multimodalities and pedagogy

The rapid expansion of multimodal resources in academic discourse is motivating considerable research. In science discourse, early contributions from SFL included Lemke (1993) on multiplicative relations of the visual and verbal in science texts, and O’Halloran (2005) on images in mathematics.

Challenges for effective academic knowledge building in online pedagogic interactions are explored in Drury (2004), Hewings and Coffin (2006), Jones (2007), Coffin and Donohue 2012 and Lander (2014, 2015). Lander notes the potential for confusion of spoken and written modes in online asynchronous discussions, and the tensions that play out in building community and building knowledge. Hood and Lander (in press) compare the meanings available to students in live lectures versus voiced-over presentation slides online. Other contributions aim to support teachers and teacher educators in addressing multimodal meaning-making in EAP (e.g. Callow 2013; de Silva Joyce & Gaudin 2007). Ongoing research and practice in this area is enhanced with developments in systemic functional theorizations of multimodality (e.g. Martinec 2005; Dreyfus, Hood & Stenglin 2011; Martin 2010), and with the developments in SFL-based tools for analyzing multimodal corpora (O’Halloran & Smith 2013) and for visualizing meaning (Almutairi 2015). See Humphrey (this volume) for further discussion of multimodality in school EAP.
Conclusion

SFL has had a long association with fields of education, including EAP, with theoretical insights informing contributions to understanding the un-commonsense nature of academic knowledge in different fields, the shaping of identities with shifts in register, the ways meanings are negotiated in knowledge building, the interactions of multiple modalities in pedagogic practice, the mapping of progression in curricula and much more. Recent collaborations with sociology of education in LCT have enhanced our research and practice in EAP, and interdisciplinary conversations have reflected back onto theory generating new insights. Space prevents more detailed discussions of important contributions to the design of pedagogies, as in Sydney School genre pedagogy and Reading to Learn, and their applications in EAP. For detailed accounts, see Rose and Martin (2012), and for a comprehensive account specific to EAP, see Coffin and Donohue (2014) and Humphrey (this volume).

In SFL-informed interventions in educational practice, there is an underlying concern that theory and research interact with pedagogic practice in the interests of more socially equitable distributions of meaning potential. Key to this project are principles of visibility and intervention, visibility in terms of the expectations for success in the genres that construct disciplinary knowledge, and intervention to subvert pedagogic practices that continue to socially stratify educational outcomes.
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