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As an academic engaging with the tortuous process of bidding for funding, from the contents page of this volume my eye was immediately drawn to a study on rhetorical patterns in research grant proposals (Koutsantoni) and I have made a mental note to revisit this chapter at a later date. Moreover, as a researcher of undergraduate writing, a postgraduate writer, and a teacher of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) this book ticks all boxes. I imagine that every reader of this journal will have some interest in academic writing, even if only as a reader and writer of research articles. This comprehensive volume covers a range of disciplines (e.g. Biology, Economics, History), examines highly specific genres (e.g. the PhD literature review, undergraduate discursive essays) and expands our knowledge of specific features of writing (e.g. restrictive adverbs, engagement features, conjunctive ties).

The book begins with a useful overall introduction by Charles which discusses the interaction between the two main methods used to explore academic writing, namely discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. Charles reminds us that while both approaches involve the identification of patterns within examples of naturally-occurring discourse, they differ substantially in their priorities. Discourse analysis is a ‘top down’ approach which “prioritizes whole texts and their cultural context” (p. 1) whereas corpus linguistics is ‘bottom up’ and “tends to… decontextualize individual texts” (p. 1). Charles convincingly makes the case for regarding these two approaches “not as opposing ideas, but as constituting a continuum… along which we can situate individual studies” (p. 5). The book is then organised into three parts; the first focuses on ‘genre and disciplinary discourses’, the second ‘interpersonal discourses’, and the third deals with ‘learner discourses’. Each editor introduces one of the three parts, guiding us through the organizing principles and providing an effective orientation for the reader. Although this tripartite structure works well, a viable alternative would be according to the nature of the academic writing investigated: whether undergraduate (8 chapters), postgraduate (3 chapters), or ‘expert’ (5 chapters). The writing focus of each chapter is briefly mentioned in the initial introduction, but I felt that academic level could have been highlighted as for some readers this would provide a useful pathway.

There are 14 chapters in all, with a good range of familiar names in each part from Flowerdew and Forest on genre, Hyland on interpersonal discourse, to Gardezi and Nesi on learner discourse. Several chapters stood out for me as particularly interesting, and here I single out one from each part (with apologies to the other authors). In part 1 (genre and disciplinary discourses), we are treated to an account of formulaic language in Biology, or more precisely sequences from research articles on the topic of the yeast Candida albicans (Pecorari). While clearly a narrow focus, Pecorari makes the point that this results in a higher number of topic-specific lexical bundles being found. These include bundles with a direct link to the research topic such as ‘of the fungal cell’, and also those particular to research articles in experimental Biology such as ‘This work was partially supported by’. The implications of this research for the language teacher include the reasonable suggestion that teaching should focus on a small range of sequences which are relevant to the student’s topic and purpose,
though Pecorari acknowledges that resourcing may be an issue here. This conclusion of the need for discipline and genre-specific teaching is in line with those of other writers in part 1; for example Holmes and Nesi discuss “discipline-specific ways of thinking and saying at nominal group and clause level” (pp 70-1), while Koutsantoni suggests that research staff who write grant proposals could be helped by courses which focus on this particular genre and how it may interact with other genres.

In part 2’s topics on interpersonal discourses, the chapter on e-conferencing by Hewings, Coffin and North broadens the research focus of the volume from ‘traditional’ academic writing to a “new type of academic writing space” (p.129). Using both corpus and discourse analysis, the authors compare writing in asynchronous electronic forums with the written academic work produced by the same students on an undergraduate course in complementary and alternative medicine. The discussion focuses on the personalization of the claims made by students in each written medium. In part 3 on learner discourse, Granger and Paquot’s study of lexical verbs in non-native academic writing makes a useful addition to debate in this area. In their exploration of EAP vocabulary they contrast the use of lemmas and word forms as units of analysis, arguing that a dual approach has much to offer. The use of expert writing as a reference corpus to measure non-native student writing seems dubious to me, though this potential criticism is addressed through a second short study of findings from native and non-native student corpora.

The book finishes with a thought-provoking afterword by Swales, in which he considers the contribution of the volume to debate on combining the two approaches, controversially concluding that it is “somewhat easier for discourse analysts to incorporate corpus linguistics than for corpus linguistics to expand their textual horizons to encompass the discoursal plane” (p. 294). Corpus linguists should take heed!

The only real flaw with the book lies with the subject index. Running to just three pages, the slightness of the index inevitably results in some omissions. For example, there is no mention of ‘stance’, ‘engagement’, or ‘formulaic sequence’, despite the fact that there are articles devoted to these. On the other hand, we are provided with the page numbers for ‘Wildlife Behavior’, ‘Architecture’ and all other disciplines discussed in individual chapters. The index lists the corpora used in the various chapters, including one named simply ‘ACAD’ which in fact consists of an amalgamation of the academic sub-parts of the MicroConcord corpus collection (Johns and Scott, 1993) and the Baby British National Corpus (cf. Burnard, 2003). Yet if corpora are listed, why not also give the corpus tools employed? This would help the reader interested in finding examples of particular software (e.g. WordSmith Tools or Antconc).

Index notwithstanding, this book is a timely and useful addition to the shelves of any corpus linguist, discourse analyst, teacher of English for Academic Purposes, or indeed anyone wishing to further their knowledge in these fields. The chapters each stand alone as individual studies of academic writing which are situated at various points along the discourse-analytic and corpus-based continuum outlined for us in the introduction, yet are carefully ordered within the volume to take the reader on a journey through the field, making the book as a whole very much more than the sum of its parts.
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