



Identifying Rhetorical Moves in Reading Response

(Spring 2025; Instructor: Andy Jiahao Liu)

Student Name: _____ Class Section No.: _____ Submission Date: _____

Instructions: *In this worksheet, you will read two published (counter)responses from the ELT Journal to understand the necessary rhetorical moves in making a response and learn useful words and phrases to prepare yourself for Project 2 Reading Response. **Please use different colors to distinguish your responses from the question texts.** Remember that you should upload the completed copy to the corresponding D2L assignment folder before the required deadline.*

Task 1: Read the following two responses and highlight the (action) verbs in **yellow**. A highlighted example is provided in each excerpt for your reference.

Excerpt 1: Galloway and Rose (2022, pp. 538–539)

- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2022). Cross-fertilisation, not bifurcation, of EMI and EAP. *ELT Journal*, 76(4), 538–546. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccac033>

⁽¹⁾In their article's title, Wingate and Hakim (2022) **refer to** moving beyond 'infancy' and towards a cross-fertilisation between English Medium Instruction (EMI) and EAP scholarship, which immediately captured our attention as a position that closely aligned with our own. ⁽²⁾We share a joint agenda to encourage a cross-fertilisation between EMI and EAP to ensure that EMI policy implementation is informed by EAP scholarship, and vice versa. ⁽³⁾This was one of our main goals in our article that discussed the impact of growing EMI provision on the ELT practitioner, where we specifically call for consultation with ELT specialists, many of whom come from a rich experience of teaching EAP. ⁽⁴⁾We agree with Wingate and Hakim that EMI and EAP are 'close relatives' in terms of the research on student support, collaboration and teacher education. ⁽⁵⁾We welcome this opportunity to expand on this joint agenda but also to clarify some points raised in the article such as the questioning over whether EMI is at a 'level of infancy' with regard to research into language-related support, teacher education and fostering collaboration between EMI and ELT practitioners, as well as the amount of EAP scholarship utilised by EMI researchers. ⁽⁶⁾We also welcome the opportunity to delve deeper into several issues touched on by Wingate and Hakim. ⁽⁷⁾In our article, and elsewhere, we highlight the value of EAP scholarship; thus, we found it worrying that in response to our own article Wingate and Hakim are critical of the growing community of EMI scholars, who they criticise for not drawing on research and practices from EAP. ⁽⁸⁾They refer to a 'lack of knowledge exchange between the two domains, as evidenced in the relative absence of EAP sources in the reference lists of EMI publications, and vice versa'. ⁽⁹⁾However, this perspective stands in contradiction to seminal work at the junction of EMI and language teaching, which was historically conducted by EAP instructors working in EMI contexts.

Excerpt 2: Hakim and Wingate (2022, p. 547)

- Hakim, A., & Wingate, U. (2022). Mapping a way forward: toward a shared EMI and EAP research agenda. *ELT Journal*, 76(4), 547–550. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccac034>

⁽¹⁾In their Counterpoint, Galloway and Rose **agree with** our call for more cross-fertilisation between English medium instruction (EMI) and EAP scholarship but remind us that there are already strong connections between the two domains. ⁽²⁾Providing as an example their own academic and professional background, they point out that many EMI scholars, in previous roles



as English language practitioners, have used EAP methods such as genre analysis and genre pedagogy. ⁽³⁾They therefore refute our critique of mutual ‘unawareness’, which we suspected on the grounds that EMI and EAP researchers rarely substantively engage with each other’s work. ⁽⁴⁾Whilst we accept that many EMI scholars may be familiar with EAP methods, it is nevertheless the case that their application to EMI contexts has hardly been considered in the EMI literature. ⁽⁵⁾Galloway and Rose explain this by the fact that EMI has a research agenda that stretches far beyond language support and many members of the EMI community focus on topics for which EAP is not informative. ⁽⁶⁾However, when it comes to the areas with which our initial paper was concerned, that is student support, collaboration between language specialists and subject lecturers, and teacher education, we maintain that the notion of EMI being in its infancy cannot be justified in relation to instructional practices, as EAP theories and pedagogies can and should be drawn upon. ⁽⁷⁾We acknowledge the authors’ clarification that it is EMI *research* in these areas that is at its early stages, and we do not at all, as the authors suggest, undervalue, or even want to ‘dismiss’ research on these topics in EMI contexts. ⁽⁸⁾On the contrary, this research is important as it contributes new insights to the EAP knowledge base, as we will discuss next. ⁽⁹⁾However, we feel that it is not fruitful to just ‘add to a body of knowledge in EAP’ without building on the knowledge that already exists.

Task 2: Reread the (action) verbs you highlighted in yellow. How do these verbs work to achieve the action or goal of the genre—reading response?

Task 3: What organizational patterns (sequence, order) do you notice between the selected excerpts? What moves do they share in their writings? Are there any differences in their writing focus?

Task 4: What common language features do you notice from their writings? Consider:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| ▪ verb tense (present, past, future) | ▪ word choice |
| ▪ passive/active voice | ▪ use of specialized vocabulary |
| ▪ contractions (e.g., it’s, I’m, we’re, you’ve) | ▪ use of pronouns |
| ▪ sentence types punctuation | ▪ sentence structures |



Task 5: Have you developed a clear idea of writing a response now? What writing procedures or features will you consider based on your move analysis of the selected excerpts above?