



WRITING AS EPISTEMIC PRACTICE: CRITICAL THINKING AND ACADEMIC WRITING DEVELOPMENT IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Nwana Edith Ngozi, PhD¹, Amaka Patricia Nwana, PhD²

¹University of Abuja, Department of Arts Education

²Igbinedion University Okada, Department of Political Science and Public Administration

ABSTRACT

Academic writing in English has long been treated within language education as a technical competency, a set of transferable skills to be acquired, assessed, and demonstrated. This paper challenges that reductive characterisation by advancing a theoretically grounded argument that academic writing is, at its core, an epistemic practice through which knowledge is not merely communicated but actively constituted. Drawing on epistemology, philosophy of language, and English language teaching and learning, the paper develops an interdisciplinary account of writing as a mode of knowing, arguing that composing in an academic register is inseparable from the critical processes through which understanding is generated, tested, and refined.

The paper proceeds through three interconnected claims. First, writing constitutes rather than records thought, a position supported by philosophical accounts of tacit knowledge, extended cognition, and the relationship between language and episteme. Second, critical thinking is linguistically mediated and cannot be meaningfully developed in separation from the discursive practices of academic writing in English. Third, prevailing English language teaching pedagogy, with its emphasis on formal correctness, genre conformity, and product-oriented assessment, systematically marginalises the epistemic agency of learners, particularly those writing in an additional language.

Together, these claims point toward the necessity of an epistemic reorientation in academic writing pedagogy, one that foregrounds writing as inquiry, positions critical engagement as central rather than supplementary, and reconceptualises the developing writer not as a skills-deficient apprentice but as a knowledge-making agent. The implications extend to curriculum design, assessment practices, and the philosophical commitments underpinning English language education.

KEYWORDS: Epistemic practice, Academic writing, Critical thinking, English language education, Philosophy of language, Writing pedagogy, Epistemic agency

SECTION I: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

1. Introduction

The question of what it means to write academically has occupied educators, linguists, and philosophers for decades, yet the dominant frameworks within English language teaching continue to approach writing primarily as a technical and procedural undertaking. Students are taught to organise paragraphs, construct thesis statements, manage cohesion, and conform to disciplinary genre conventions. These are not trivial concerns, and the pedagogical traditions that have developed around them reflect genuine insights into how academic discourse functions. Nevertheless, something of considerable importance is lost when writing is reduced to its formal and structural dimensions. What is lost, this paper argues, is the epistemic dimension of writing, the recognition that to write academically is not simply to report what one knows but to engage in the very process through which knowledge is made.

This argument is not entirely without precedent. Philosophers of language and education have long noted the relationship between linguistic expression and cognitive development. Vygotsky (1986) demonstrated that written language is not a secondary representation of thought but a qualitatively distinct mode of intellectual activity that reorganises and deepens understanding. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) distinguished between knowledge-telling and knowledge-transforming

writing, observing that only the latter engages the writer in genuine epistemic work. More recently, scholars in writing studies have drawn on Bazerman's (1988) work on disciplinary knowledge construction to argue that academic writing is constitutively bound up with the production of knowledge in specific fields. Yet despite this body of scholarship, mainstream English language teaching pedagogy has remained largely unmoved, continuing to privilege correctness, fluency, and formal appropriacy over epistemic engagement.

The reasons for this persistence are not difficult to identify. Language teaching operates under institutional pressures that favour measurable outcomes, and epistemic qualities such as intellectual depth, genuine inquiry, and critical originality are considerably more difficult to assess than grammatical accuracy or structural coherence. Furthermore, the field of English for Academic Purposes has historically positioned itself as a service discipline, preparing learners to enter existing academic discourse communities rather than questioning the epistemological assumptions embedded within those communities (Hyland, 2006). The result is a pedagogy that is highly effective at producing formally competent writers and considerably less effective at producing independent intellectual agents.



This paper intervenes in that space by bringing together two fields that rarely speak directly to one another. From philosophy, it draws on epistemological accounts of knowledge construction, tacit knowing, and extended cognition to establish a theoretical basis for understanding writing as a knowledge-making act. From English language education, it draws on research into academic writing development, critical thinking pedagogy, and the particular challenges facing multilingual writers in Anglophone academic contexts. The convergence of these two traditions, it is argued, produces a more adequate account of what academic writing is and what its development requires than either tradition can offer independently.

The paper advances three principal claims that are developed across the sections that follow. The first is that writing in an academic context constitutes thought rather than merely encoding it, and that this constitutive relationship has been insufficiently theorised within language education. The second is that critical thinking, properly understood, is not a set of transferable cognitive skills but a practice that is deeply and necessarily linguistic, shaped by the specific discursive norms and argumentative conventions of academic writing in English. The third is that the tension between epistemic agency and formal conformity in English language writing pedagogy represents not merely a curricular challenge but a philosophical problem concerning the nature of knowledge, voice, and intellectual authority in second language academic contexts.

Together these claims support a broader argument for what the paper terms an epistemic reorientation in academic writing pedagogy. This reorientation does not require the abandonment of existing approaches to genre, process, or language development. Rather, it calls for their reconceptualisation within a framework that places the development of the writer as a knowing subject at the centre of pedagogical concern. The sections that follow develop the theoretical and analytical grounds for this reorientation, beginning with an account of the methodological approach that structures the inquiry.

2. Materials And Methods

This paper is situated within the tradition of theoretical and philosophical inquiry in education, a mode of scholarship that takes as its primary material not empirical data collected from participants or experimental conditions but the conceptual resources available within relevant intellectual traditions. As such, the methodology employed here is one of systematic conceptual analysis and critical interdisciplinary synthesis. The aim is not to test a hypothesis against observable evidence but to construct a theoretically coherent and argumentatively defensible account of writing as epistemic practice by drawing on, interrogating, and integrating ideas from epistemology, philosophy of language, and English language education research.

Conceptual analysis, as a philosophical method, involves the careful examination of key terms and the assumptions embedded within them, with the aim of clarifying their meaning, exposing their limitations, and reconstructing them in more adequate forms (Hospers, 1997). In the context of this

paper, the concepts subjected to this form of analysis include academic writing, critical thinking, epistemic practice, and pedagogical agency. Each of these terms carries considerable theoretical freight within its home discipline, and each is frequently used in ways that obscure important distinctions or foreclose productive lines of inquiry. By subjecting them to sustained conceptual scrutiny, this paper seeks to establish a more precise and philosophically defensible vocabulary for discussing the relationship between writing and knowing in English language education.

The second methodological strand employed in this paper is critical hermeneutics, understood as the interpretive practice of reading texts, arguments, and theoretical positions in relation to the broader intellectual and institutional contexts from which they emerge (Ricoeur, 1981). This approach is particularly appropriate for an interdisciplinary inquiry of this kind, since it permits engagement not only with the explicit claims made by theorists in different fields but also with the underlying assumptions, values, and epistemological commitments that shape those claims. Critical hermeneutics thus provides a means of moving between philosophical and educational literatures without flattening the differences between them or artificially imposing unity where genuine tension exists.

The literature engaged in this inquiry spans four principal domains. The first is the philosophy of knowledge, with particular attention to accounts of tacit knowing developed by Polanyi (1966), the extended mind thesis advanced by Clark and Chalmers (1998), and the concept of epistemic injustice introduced by Fricker (2007). These philosophical resources provide the theoretical foundation for the paper's account of writing as a constitutive epistemic activity. The second domain is the philosophy of language and mind, drawing primarily on Vygotsky's (1986) account of the relationship between thought and language and Bakhtin's (1986) theorisation of voice, dialogue, and the social dimensions of utterance. These perspectives ground the paper's argument that critical thinking is irreducibly linguistic and dialogic in character.

The third domain is writing studies and rhetoric, with particular reference to Bazerman's (1988) work on disciplinary knowledge construction, Bereiter and Scardamalia's (1987) distinction between knowledge-telling and knowledge-transforming writing, and more recent scholarship on writing as inquiry and writing across the curriculum. This body of work provides empirical and theoretical grounding for the claim that academic writing, when approached adequately, functions as a mode of intellectual inquiry rather than a vehicle for the transmission of pre-formed ideas. The fourth domain is English language teaching and English for Academic Purposes research, drawing on Hyland's (2006) work on academic discourse and genre, Canagarajah's (2002) critique of dominant EAP epistemologies, and scholarship on the challenges of epistemic positioning facing multilingual academic writers.

The selection of sources across these four domains has been guided by three criteria. The first is theoretical centrality, meaning that priority has been given to works that are



foundational or highly influential within their respective fields and that bear directly on the paper's central argument. The second is interdisciplinary relevance, meaning that preference has been given to works that speak across disciplinary boundaries or that have been taken up productively by scholars outside their field of origin. The third is critical range, meaning that the paper has deliberately sought out perspectives that challenge or complicate its central argument, including accounts that defend genre conformity, that are sceptical of the pedagogical value of epistemic framing, or that question the translatability of philosophical concepts into educational practice.

It should be noted that the methodology of theoretical inquiry carries its own limitations, which are acknowledged at the conclusion of this paper. Chief among these is the absence of empirical verification. The claims advanced here are theoretically grounded and argumentatively supported, but they await the kind of sustained empirical investigation that would test their applicability in actual classrooms and writing development contexts. This paper therefore positions itself as a theoretical contribution that opens rather than closes the conversation between philosophy, language education, and writing pedagogy.

SECTION II: ANALYSIS AND CONTRIBUTION

3. Results

3.1 Writing and Episteme: Philosophical Foundations

The relationship between writing and knowledge is among the oldest and most contested questions in the philosophy of language. Plato's suspicion of writing, articulated through the figure of Socrates in the *Phaedrus*, established an enduring tension that continues to inflect how literate practices are theorised and valued. For Plato, writing was epistemically inferior to speech because it was inert, incapable of responding to questions, and therefore unable to participate in the dialectical process through which genuine knowledge is pursued. Writing, on this account, produces the appearance of wisdom rather than wisdom itself, offering readers the semblance of understanding without the cognitive labour that understanding requires (Plato, trans. 1995). This critique, whatever its limitations, identifies something philosophically significant: that the relationship between inscription and knowing is not straightforward, and that the act of writing cannot be assumed to be equivalent to the act of thinking.

The twentieth century produced a sustained philosophical challenge to this Platonic suspicion, relocating the question of writing within broader accounts of cognition, language, and knowledge. Among the most consequential of these contributions is Michael Polanyi's account of tacit knowledge, developed most fully in *The Tacit Dimension* (1966). Polanyi's central claim is that all knowledge has a tacit coefficient, that we always know more than we can explicitly articulate, and that the explicit, codified forms of knowledge that dominate academic life rest upon a vast substrate of embodied, pre-reflective understanding that resists full formalisation. The implications of this account for writing are considerable. If knowledge is in significant part tacit, then the act of writing,

which requires the writer to bring implicit understanding into explicit linguistic form, is not merely a recording process but a transformative cognitive act. To write about what one knows is simultaneously to discover the limits and contours of what one knows, to encounter the resistance of one's own understanding, and to extend or revise that understanding in the process of articulating it. Writing, on this reading, is not a downstream product of thinking but an integral part of the thinking process itself.

This position finds further philosophical support in the extended mind thesis developed by Clark and Chalmers (1998), which challenges the assumption that cognition is bounded by the skin and skull of the individual thinker. Clark and Chalmers argue that cognitive processes extend into the environment when external tools and representations are reliably coupled with internal mental states in ways that contribute to the production of intelligent behaviour. Writing, as a system of external symbolic representation, fits this description precisely. When a writer externalises an argument onto the page, that externalised representation becomes part of the cognitive system through which the argument is developed, evaluated, and refined. The page is not merely a record of thought but a cognitive workspace in which thinking occurs. This perspective has significant implications for how writing development is understood pedagogically. If writing is a form of extended cognition, then to develop as a writer is not simply to acquire a set of textual skills but to develop a more powerful and flexible cognitive apparatus for intellectual inquiry.

The philosophical significance of the extended mind thesis for writing pedagogy extends beyond its implications for individual cognitive development. It also challenges the epistemological individualism that underlies much of the assessment of academic writing, the assumption that the knowledge demonstrated in a written text is the exclusive product of the individual writer's mind and should be evaluated as such. If cognition is distributed across writers, texts, tools, and social environments, then the assessment of academic writing as an index of individual cognitive capacity is philosophically problematic. This does not imply that individual assessment is without value, but it does suggest that a more adequate epistemology of academic writing would attend to the social and material conditions within which writing is produced, rather than treating the finished text as a transparent window onto the individual writer's knowledge and reasoning.

Derrida's (1976) intervention in the philosophy of writing, developed in *Of Grammatology*, offers a further and more radical challenge to the Platonic privileging of speech over writing. Derrida argues that the opposition between speech and writing is not a neutral descriptive distinction but a hierarchical and ideologically loaded one that reflects a deeper metaphysical commitment to the idea of presence, the notion that meaning is most fully and authentically expressed in the living voice of a speaker who is present to their own meaning. Writing, on the Platonic account, is derivative and dangerous precisely because it introduces absence, deferral, and the possibility of



misinterpretation. Derrida's deconstruction of this hierarchy does not simply invert it, privileging writing over speech, but demonstrates that the properties attributed to writing, its iterability, its detachment from authorial intention, its openness to multiple readings, are in fact properties of language as such. Every utterance, spoken or written, is subject to the logic of the trace, the irreducible alterity that makes communication both possible and unstable. While Derrida's position is considerably more radical than the epistemological claims advanced in this paper, his analysis illuminates the philosophical stakes of the speech-writing distinction and provides a further basis for questioning the assumption that writing is an epistemically secondary or derivative activity.

A further philosophical dimension of the relationship between writing and knowledge is introduced by Miranda Fricker's (2007) concept of epistemic injustice, which draws attention to the ways in which social and structural inequalities shape who is recognised as a legitimate knower and whose knowledge claims are accorded credibility within epistemic communities. Fricker distinguishes between testimonial injustice, which occurs when a speaker receives less credibility than they deserve due to prejudice, and hermeneutical injustice, which occurs when a gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage in making sense of their own social experience. Both forms of epistemic injustice are relevant to the situation of multilingual writers in Anglophone academic contexts, who frequently encounter institutional structures that implicitly or explicitly devalue their epistemic contributions on the basis of linguistic difference. The concept of epistemic injustice therefore provides a critical philosophical lens through which the power relations embedded in academic writing pedagogy can be examined and challenged.

The work of Lorraine Code (1991) on epistemic responsibility adds a further dimension to this philosophical account. Code argues that knowing is not a passive reception of information but an active and responsible practice, one that involves the knower in ongoing commitments of intellectual care, critical self-scrutiny, and accountability to the epistemic community. This account of knowing as a practice of responsibility resonates strongly with the understanding of academic writing developed in this paper. To write academically with epistemic responsibility is to take genuine intellectual ownership of one's claims, to subject one's reasoning to rigorous scrutiny, to engage honestly with counterarguments and competing perspectives, and to situate one's contribution within the broader conversation of one's field. These are not merely rhetorical virtues but epistemic ones, and their development should be understood as a central aim of academic writing pedagogy rather than a supplementary concern.

3.2 Critical Thinking as Epistemic Agency: From Dewey to Vygotsky and Bakhtin

Critical thinking occupies a privileged position in contemporary educational discourse. It appears prominently in curriculum frameworks, graduate attributes statements, and institutional mission documents across the English-speaking world and beyond. Yet despite its ubiquity, the concept remains theoretically underdeveloped within much of the educational

literature in which it appears, typically reduced to a list of cognitive skills such as analysis, evaluation, inference, and synthesis that are treated as transferable across contexts and disciplines. This skills-based conception of critical thinking has been subjected to sustained philosophical criticism, and that criticism has important implications for how the relationship between critical thinking and academic writing is understood.

The philosophical tradition from which contemporary accounts of critical thinking draw most directly is the pragmatist tradition inaugurated by John Dewey. Dewey's (1910) account of reflective thinking, developed in *How We Think*, identifies genuine thinking as a response to felt difficulty, a process triggered by doubt and directed toward the resolution of a problematic situation. For Dewey, thinking is not an abstract cognitive operation performed upon neutral content but a purposive, contextually embedded activity that is inseparable from the situation that occasions it. This situational and purposive character of genuine thinking has significant implications for critical thinking pedagogy. If thinking is always thinking about something, in response to a specific intellectual difficulty, within a particular disciplinary or social context, then the notion that critical thinking skills can be taught in abstraction from content and context is philosophically untenable. Critical thinking is not a skill that is acquired once and then applied across domains; it is a practice that is developed through sustained engagement with specific forms of inquiry within specific epistemic communities.

McPeck (1981), whose critique of the generic critical thinking movement remains one of the most philosophically rigorous in the literature, extends Dewey's situational account into a direct challenge to the assumptions of programmes designed to teach critical thinking as a subject in its own right. McPeck argues that thinking is always thinking about something, and that the logical and evaluative standards that govern good thinking vary significantly across disciplines and domains of knowledge. A physicist and a literary critic may both be excellent critical thinkers, but the standards, methods, and forms of reasoning that constitute critical thinking in physics are fundamentally different from those that constitute it in literary criticism. Generic critical thinking instruction, which abstracts reasoning skills from their disciplinary contexts, therefore fails to develop the kind of contextually situated critical capacity that genuine intellectual work requires. This argument has direct implications for writing pedagogy, insofar as it suggests that the development of critical academic writing cannot be achieved through generic writing skills instruction but requires immersion in the specific epistemic practices of particular disciplinary communities.

Vygotsky's (1986) account of the relationship between thought and language provides a further and deeper challenge to the decontextualised skills model of critical thinking. For Vygotsky, thought and language are not independent processes that are subsequently combined; they develop in relation to one another in ways that fundamentally shape the character of both. Written language, in particular, occupies a special place in Vygotsky's developmental psychology because it demands a



higher degree of deliberateness and abstraction than oral communication. The writer cannot rely on the shared context, intonation, and immediate feedback that support meaning-making in face-to-face interaction; instead, meaning must be constructed entirely through the resources of language itself. This demand for explicitness and abstraction makes writing a uniquely powerful instrument for the development of higher-order thinking. To write an academic argument is to be compelled to make one's reasoning visible, sequential, and accountable to the reader in ways that spoken discourse rarely requires. The discipline of writing is, on this account, simultaneously a discipline of thinking.

The concept of the zone of proximal development, also developed by Vygotsky (1978), has important implications for understanding how writing development and critical thinking development are related pedagogically. The zone of proximal development refers to the distance between what a learner can achieve independently and what they can achieve with the support of a more capable peer or instructor. Writing, conceived as an epistemic practice, is a domain in which this zone is particularly rich and consequential. A learner who is supported to engage in genuine argumentative writing, to construct and defend original intellectual positions, to respond critically to the arguments of others, and to revise their own reasoning in the light of feedback, is operating in a zone of proximal development that extends not only their writing competence but their capacity for independent intellectual inquiry. The pedagogical implication is that writing instruction should be designed to scaffold genuine epistemic engagement rather than to model and reproduce textual forms.

Bakhtin's (1986) theorisation of voice, dialogue, and the heteroglossic character of language adds a social and relational dimension to this account of writing and thought that is particularly important for understanding critical thinking in academic contexts. For Bakhtin, every utterance is populated with the voices of others; language is never neutral or pristine but always already saturated with the social, ideological, and disciplinary meanings that have accrued to it through its history of use. To write academically is therefore not simply to express one's own ideas in a chosen register but to enter into a complex dialogue with prior voices in one's discipline, to position oneself in relation to existing arguments, to appropriate and transform the language of others in the service of one's own intellectual purposes. This dialogic dimension of academic writing is, arguably, the dimension most thoroughly suppressed by product-oriented writing pedagogy, which tends to treat the academic essay as a vehicle for the demonstration of acquired knowledge rather than as a site of genuine intellectual engagement with competing ideas and perspectives.

Habermas's (1984) theory of communicative action offers a further philosophical perspective on the social dimensions of critical thinking and academic writing that complements and extends the Bakhtinian account. For Habermas, rational discourse is characterised by an orientation toward mutual understanding achieved through the unforced force of the better argument. Participants in rational discourse submit their claims

to the scrutiny of others, respond to objections, revise their positions in the light of better arguments, and ultimately seek consensus on the basis of reasoned exchange rather than power or authority. Academic writing, at its best, participates in this communicative ideal, subjecting knowledge claims to the critical scrutiny of a disciplinary community and contributing to the collective enterprise of rational inquiry. This Habermasian perspective on academic writing reinforces the argument that critical thinking in writing is not a private cognitive achievement but a social and communicative practice, one that is developed through participation in the argumentative culture of academic discourse.

The reconceptualisation of critical thinking as a linguistically mediated, contextually situated, and dialogically structured epistemic practice has direct implications for English language education. It suggests that the development of critical thinking in academic writing contexts is not a matter of teaching generic analytical skills that can subsequently be applied to written tasks, but of cultivating the specific discursive competencies through which writers learn to position themselves within disciplinary conversations, construct and evaluate arguments in genre-specific ways, and exercise genuine intellectual agency within the constraints and affordances of academic discourse.

3.3 Academic Writing in English: Pedagogical Models and Epistemic Tensions

The history of writing pedagogy in English language education is characterised by a succession of theoretical frameworks that have each, in different ways, grappled with the tension between formal competence and intellectual development. The product approach, which dominated writing instruction through much of the mid-twentieth century, focused on the analysis and imitation of model texts, privileging formal correctness, structural organisation, and adherence to the conventions of standard written English. While this approach was effective in transmitting the surface features of academic prose, it provided little opportunity for learners to develop as independent thinkers, positioning them instead as apprentices to existing textual forms whose task was imitation rather than inquiry.

The process approach, which emerged as a response to the perceived limitations of product-oriented instruction in the 1970s and 1980s, represented a significant reorientation of pedagogical attention from the text to the writer. Influenced by cognitive psychology and composition studies, process approaches foregrounded the recursive, non-linear character of writing as an activity, emphasising pre-writing, drafting, revision, and reflection as stages in a meaning-making process rather than steps in the production of a finished artefact (Flower & Hayes, 1981). This shift brought writing pedagogy considerably closer to an epistemic understanding of writing, insofar as it recognised that meaning is discovered and constructed through the act of writing rather than fully formed prior to it. However, the process approach has been criticised for its tendency toward an overly individualised and psychologistic account of writing that neglects the social, cultural, and institutional contexts within which writing is always produced and evaluated (Hyland, 2003).



The genre approach, which became influential in Australian and British educational contexts from the 1980s onward and which has had a significant impact on English for Academic Purposes, addressed this limitation by situating writing within the social contexts of its production and reception. Drawing on systemic functional linguistics, genre theorists argued that different social purposes are realised through different textual forms, and that explicit teaching of the structural and linguistic features of target genres is both possible and necessary, particularly for learners who do not have access to the tacit knowledge of academic discourse that privileged educational backgrounds tend to confer (Martin, 1993). The genre approach has made important contributions to writing pedagogy, particularly in its attention to the social and institutional dimensions of academic discourse. Nevertheless, it has also been criticised for the extent to which it can, in practice, reduce writing instruction to the mastery of textual templates, potentially reinforcing the very conformity it seeks to explain.

Street's (1984) influential distinction between autonomous and ideological models of literacy provides a valuable theoretical lens through which the epistemological assumptions of different writing pedagogies can be examined. The autonomous model treats literacy as a set of neutral, context-free skills whose acquisition produces cognitive benefits independently of the social and cultural contexts in which literacy is practised. The ideological model, by contrast, insists that literacy practices are always embedded in social structures, power relations, and ideological frameworks that shape what counts as legitimate literacy, whose literacy practices are valued, and what purposes literacy is understood to serve. Applied to academic writing pedagogy, Street's framework reveals that the dominant approaches within English language education have largely operated within an autonomous model, treating academic writing competence as a set of technical skills to be acquired and assessed independently of the epistemological and ideological dimensions of academic discourse. An ideological model of academic writing literacy, by contrast, would attend to the ways in which the conventions of academic writing in English encode particular epistemological commitments, rhetorical traditions, and power relations that are neither universal nor neutral.

Hyland (2006), one of the most influential contemporary theorists of academic writing and English for Academic Purposes, has argued persuasively for a disciplinary approach to academic literacy that attends to the specific conventions, values, and epistemological commitments of different academic fields. On this account, to write in a discipline is not merely to adopt its textual conventions but to internalise its ways of constructing and warranting knowledge claims, its standards of evidence and argumentation, and its characteristic modes of intellectual engagement. This disciplinary perspective represents a significant step toward an epistemic understanding of academic writing, insofar as it recognises that genre conventions are not arbitrary formal requirements but are expressive of the epistemological commitments of specific knowledge communities. However, it leaves open the question of how learners, and particularly multilingual learners writing

in English as an additional language, are to develop genuine epistemic agency within disciplinary frameworks that were not designed with their intellectual traditions, rhetorical backgrounds, or linguistic resources in mind.

This question is addressed with particular force by Canagarajah (2002), whose critical perspective on English for Academic Purposes draws attention to the ways in which dominant models of academic writing encode the epistemological assumptions of specific cultural and linguistic communities, particularly those of the Anglophone academic mainstream. Canagarajah argues that multilingual writers are frequently positioned within EAP contexts as deficient speakers of English rather than as intellectually capable agents who bring their own knowledge traditions and rhetorical resources to the task of academic writing. This deficit positioning has epistemic as well as linguistic consequences, insofar as it encourages learners to suppress their own intellectual perspectives and adopt the voice and reasoning patterns of the dominant academic culture rather than developing the capacity for critical and original engagement with disciplinary knowledge.

Lillis and Curry (2010) extend this critical perspective through their longitudinal research on academic publishing practices among scholars writing in English as an additional language. Their findings reveal that multilingual scholars navigating the demands of international academic publishing face not only linguistic but epistemological barriers, encountering systematic pressures to conform to the rhetorical and argumentative norms of Anglophone academic discourse at the expense of alternative intellectual traditions and ways of constructing knowledge. This research provides empirical grounding for the theoretical argument advanced in this paper, demonstrating that the epistemic marginalisation of multilingual writers is not a theoretical abstraction but a documented reality with significant consequences for the diversity and vitality of academic knowledge production.

3.4 Writing as Inquiry: Toward an Epistemic Turn in Writing Pedagogy

The concept of writing as inquiry has a substantial intellectual history in composition studies and writing across the curriculum research, though it has received considerably less attention within English language teaching and English for Academic Purposes than its theoretical significance warrants. At its core, the idea of writing as inquiry holds that writing is not simply a means of communicating conclusions already reached through other cognitive processes but is itself a primary instrument of intellectual investigation, a way of posing questions, pursuing lines of thought, discovering contradictions, and arriving at understanding that would not have been achievable through reading or reflection alone.

Bazerman's (1988) foundational work on writing and disciplinary knowledge construction provides one of the most theoretically developed accounts of this position. Bazerman traces the ways in which the development of modern scientific and academic disciplines was inseparable from the development of the written forms through which knowledge in



those disciplines was produced, communicated, and legitimated. The experimental report, the literature review, the theoretical argument, and the critical essay are not neutral containers for pre-existing knowledge but are themselves instruments of inquiry that shape what questions can be asked, what counts as evidence, and what forms of reasoning are recognised as valid. To learn to write in a discipline is therefore to learn to think in that discipline, to internalise not only its textual conventions but the epistemic practices through which it constructs and evaluates knowledge.

The distinction drawn by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) between knowledge-telling and knowledge-transforming writing illuminates one of the central pedagogical stakes of this argument. Knowledge-telling writing, which characterises the approach of many developing academic writers, involves retrieving relevant information from memory and transcribing it in an organised form. The writing task is treated as a retrieval and organisation problem, and the writer's knowledge is not fundamentally altered by the act of writing. Knowledge-transforming writing, by contrast, involves a continuous interaction between the writer's developing understanding of the content and their developing understanding of the rhetorical and epistemic demands of the writing task. The writer does not simply report what they know but uses the demands of the writing task as a lever for reorganising, deepening, and extending their understanding. This distinction maps directly onto the difference between a writing pedagogy that treats writing as a vehicle for demonstrating acquired knowledge and one that treats writing as an instrument of knowledge construction.

Elbow's (1998) influential account of writing as a mode of discovery offers a complementary perspective from within composition studies that reinforces the epistemic argument developed in this paper. Elbow argues that the most productive forms of writing begin not with a clear thesis to be demonstrated but with genuine uncertainty to be explored, and that the process of writing itself, when approached with intellectual honesty and openness, generates understanding that could not have been predicted at the outset. This view of writing as generative and exploratory rather than demonstrative and confirmatory represents a direct challenge to the thesis-first models of academic writing instruction that dominate English language teaching contexts, in which students are typically taught to formulate a clear argument before beginning to write and to treat the writing process as the organisation and expression of pre-formed ideas. Elbow's account suggests, by contrast, that the premature closure of inquiry that thesis-first models encourage may actively impede the development of genuine critical thinking by foreclosing the exploratory cognitive work through which real understanding is developed. The writing-to-learn movement in composition studies has developed these insights into a range of pedagogical practices designed to harness the epistemic potential of writing in disciplinary learning contexts. Writing-to-learn approaches, which include practices such as exploratory writing, reflective journaling, and argumentative drafting, proceed from the recognition that the cognitive demands of writing, its

requirements of explicitness, sequentiality, and coherent reasoning, make it a uniquely powerful instrument for the consolidation and extension of understanding (Klein, 1999). These approaches have demonstrated significant effects on the quality of disciplinary learning in empirical studies, though their uptake within English language teaching contexts has been limited by the persistent tendency to treat writing as a linguistic rather than an epistemic achievement.

Menary's (2007) philosophical account of cognitive integration provides a further theoretical basis for understanding how writing functions as an instrument of inquiry. Menary argues that writing is not simply an external record of internal cognitive processes but a practice through which cognitive processes are transformed and extended. The act of writing integrates internal mental states with external representational systems in ways that produce genuinely new cognitive capacities, enabling forms of reasoning, planning, and critical reflection that would not be possible without the written medium. This account of writing as cognitively integrative reinforces the argument that the development of academic writing is not a peripheral concern of English language education but a central one, insofar as it is through the development of writing as a cognitive practice that learners develop their capacity for the kind of sustained, rigorous, and original intellectual work that academic study demands.

The implications of writing-as-inquiry for multilingual academic writers are particularly significant. Scholars such as Casanave (2002) have documented the ways in which the process of writing in an academic second language is a deeply transformative intellectual experience, requiring writers to negotiate not only the linguistic demands of English academic prose but the epistemological assumptions embedded within it, the norms of argumentation, the standards of evidence, the expectations of critical engagement, and the conventions of intellectual positioning that together constitute the epistemic culture of Anglophone academic writing. This negotiation is not merely a linguistic challenge but an intellectual and identity-forming one, involving the writer's sense of themselves as a knower, as an agent capable of generating and defending original intellectual positions within a community of scholars.

Ivanič's (1998) research on writer identity in academic contexts illuminates this dimension of writing development with particular precision. Ivanič argues that academic writing is always an act of identity, in which writers position themselves in relation to the discourses, values, and epistemological commitments of their disciplinary communities. The development of an academic writer is therefore not simply a matter of acquiring linguistic and rhetorical competencies but of constructing an intellectual identity, a sense of oneself as a legitimate participant in academic knowledge-making with something original and valuable to contribute. This identity dimension of writing development is systematically neglected within approaches that reduce academic writing to formal competence, and its neglect has particularly serious consequences for multilingual writers whose sense of intellectual legitimacy is already subject to the structural



pressures of epistemic injustice documented by Fricker (2007) and Canagarajah (2002).

The concept of epistemic agency is central to this understanding of writing development. An epistemically agentive writer is one who does not merely reproduce the arguments and conclusions of authoritative sources but who uses those sources as resources for the construction of original intellectual positions, who engages critically with competing perspectives, who recognises and makes explicit the assumptions underlying their own reasoning, and who takes genuine intellectual responsibility for the claims they advance. The development of epistemic agency in academic writing is, on this account, not a luxury confined to advanced or native-speaking writers but a fundamental educational goal that should inform writing pedagogy from the earliest stages of academic literacy development, including in English language teaching and learning contexts where it is most frequently neglected.

4. Discussion

The theoretical analysis presented in the preceding section converges on a finding of considerable significance for both philosophy of education and English language teaching: that the dominant frameworks through which academic writing has been conceptualised, taught, and assessed in English language education are epistemologically inadequate. They are inadequate not in the sense that they are without value or that the insights they have generated are without merit, but in the more fundamental sense that they operate with an impoverished understanding of what writing is and what its development entails. The results of this inquiry suggest that a more adequate account of academic writing must be grounded in an explicitly epistemic framework, one that takes seriously the philosophical evidence that writing constitutes thought, that critical thinking is irreducibly linguistic, and that the suppression of epistemic agency in writing pedagogy carries consequences that extend well beyond the classroom.

The first and perhaps most theoretically consequential finding of this inquiry concerns the constitutive relationship between writing and knowing. The philosophical accounts examined in the results section, from Polanyi's (1966) theorisation of tacit knowledge to Clark and Chalmers' (1998) extended mind thesis, and from Derrida's (1976) deconstruction of the speech-writing hierarchy to Code's (1991) account of epistemic responsibility, collectively establish that writing is not a secondary or derivative cognitive activity but a primary mode through which knowledge is constructed, tested, and refined. This finding stands in direct tension with the assumptions embedded in product-oriented writing pedagogy, which implicitly treats writing as a reporting activity, a means of externalising and communicating knowledge that has already been formed through other means. If the philosophical account developed in this paper is correct, then a pedagogy organised around the production of formally correct texts is not merely incomplete but is oriented toward the wrong object entirely. It cultivates competence in textual performance while neglecting the development of writing as a cognitive and epistemic instrument.

This tension is most sharply visible in the context of assessment. The assessment of academic writing in English language education contexts is overwhelmingly organised around textual features: grammatical accuracy, lexical range, structural coherence, and adherence to genre conventions. These are not irrelevant criteria, and there are good reasons, both practical and philosophical, for attending to the formal dimensions of academic prose. However, when formal criteria dominate assessment to the exclusion of epistemic ones, the implicit message communicated to learners is that writing is fundamentally a performance of linguistic competence rather than an exercise of intellectual agency. This message is pedagogically damaging in ways that go beyond the individual writer, insofar as it shapes the broader culture of writing within educational institutions and reinforces an understanding of academic literacy that is, at its core, epistemologically conservative. Rust, Price, and O'Donovan (2003) have argued that assessment practices in higher education carry powerful socialising effects, communicating to students not only what is valued in their work but what kind of intellectual activity academic study is understood to involve. When those practices consistently reward formal correctness over epistemic engagement, they socialise learners into a conception of academic writing as performance rather than inquiry, with consequences for the quality and originality of intellectual work that extend well beyond individual writing tasks.

The relationship between assessment and epistemic development raises broader questions about the institutional conditions under which epistemic writing pedagogy is possible. Ball (2003) has drawn attention to the ways in which the culture of performativity that pervades contemporary educational institutions, with its emphasis on measurable outcomes, accountability mechanisms, and the audit of observable competencies, creates structural pressures that work systematically against pedagogical approaches oriented toward intellectual depth, critical originality, and epistemic agency. These are precisely the qualities that an epistemic writing pedagogy seeks to cultivate, and they are precisely the qualities that are most resistant to the kind of standardised measurement that institutional accountability frameworks demand. The tension between epistemic writing pedagogy and the performative culture of contemporary education is therefore not merely a curricular challenge but a political one, requiring engagement with the institutional and policy conditions that shape what is possible in writing classrooms.

The second major finding of this inquiry concerns the linguistically mediated character of critical thinking. The analysis of Vygotsky (1986), Bakhtin (1986), Dewey (1910), McPeck (1981), and Habermas (1984) developed in the results section collectively establishes that critical thinking is not a context-free cognitive capacity that can be developed independently of the specific linguistic and discursive practices within which it is exercised. This finding has direct implications for a significant body of educational policy and practice that proceeds on the assumption that critical thinking skills can be taught generically and then transferred to disciplinary writing



contexts. The philosophical evidence examined in this paper suggests that this assumption is not merely optimistic but theoretically untenable. Critical thinking in academic writing is developed through sustained engagement with the specific argumentative conventions, epistemic standards, and discursive norms of particular knowledge communities, and it cannot be adequately cultivated through generic skills instruction detached from those communities.

This conclusion does not imply that explicit instruction in argumentation, reasoning, and textual organisation is without value. Rather, it implies that such instruction is most productively conceived not as the teaching of transferable skills but as an initiation into the epistemic practices of specific academic communities, practices that are simultaneously linguistic, cognitive, and social in character. The pedagogical implication is that writing instruction and disciplinary learning cannot be treated as separate enterprises; the development of academic writing is inseparable from the development of disciplinary understanding, and the two should be integrated at every stage of the curriculum. This position resonates with the arguments advanced by scholars in the writing across the curriculum and writing in the disciplines movements in North American higher education, who have long maintained that writing development is most effectively supported when it is embedded within the content and intellectual practices of specific disciplinary communities rather than addressed in isolation in dedicated writing courses (Russell, 1991).

The Habermasian perspective on academic writing as participation in communicative rationality adds an important normative dimension to this argument. If academic writing is understood as a practice oriented toward the achievement of mutual understanding through reasoned argument, then the development of academic writing is not merely an educational goal but an ethical one, bound up with the cultivation of the intellectual virtues and communicative dispositions that sustain the practice of rational inquiry. These virtues include intellectual honesty, the willingness to engage seriously with counterarguments, the capacity for genuine revision of one's own positions in the light of better arguments, and the commitment to the norms of evidence and reasoning that govern legitimate knowledge claims within one's disciplinary community. A writing pedagogy that neglects these virtues in favour of formal competence is one that fails its students not only intellectually but ethically, insofar as it does not prepare them for genuine participation in the communicative practices through which academic knowledge is produced and evaluated.

The third finding of this inquiry concerns the structural marginalisation of epistemic agency within prevailing English language writing pedagogy. The critical perspectives of Canagarajah (2002), Lillis and Curry (2010), and Ivanič (1998), together with the epistemological framework provided by Fricker (2007) and the ideological model of literacy advanced by Street (1984), illuminate a pattern that is both pedagogically and ethically significant. Multilingual writers in Anglophone academic contexts are frequently positioned, through the combined effects of deficit-oriented language assessment,

genre-conformist writing instruction, and the epistemological ethnocentrism of dominant EAP frameworks, in ways that systematically undervalue their capacity for independent intellectual contribution. The epistemic injustice that results from this positioning is not an incidental feature of specific institutional arrangements but a structural consequence of an approach to writing pedagogy that conflates linguistic difference with intellectual deficiency.

Addressing this structural problem requires more than curricular adjustment. It requires a philosophical reorientation in how academic writing development is conceptualised at the level of educational theory and policy. Norton's (2000) work on identity and language learning is instructive in this regard. Norton argues that language learners are not simply acquiring a neutral communicative tool but are negotiating complex questions of identity, power, and social positioning in their engagement with a second language and its associated cultural practices. In the context of academic writing in English, this means that the development of writing competence is inseparable from the development of a sense of oneself as a legitimate intellectual agent within an academic community, and that pedagogical approaches that position learners as deficient language users rather than as developing epistemic agents actively undermine the identity formation that genuine writing development requires. The implications of this argument for how writing teachers conceptualise their role and their students are considerable, pointing toward a pedagogy of intellectual affirmation and epistemic inclusion rather than one of remediation and conformity.

This paper proposes that the epistemic reorientation it advocates be organised around three constitutive dimensions of academic writing that have emerged from the analysis presented in the results section. The first is writing as inquiry, understood as the practice of using writing to pose genuine questions, pursue lines of argument, and arrive at understanding that is produced through rather than prior to the act of composition. This dimension finds its strongest pedagogical expression in approaches such as exploratory writing, problem-based writing tasks, and the cultivation of what Elbow (1998) calls the believing and doubting game, the practice of engaging with ideas first with full imaginative sympathy and then with rigorous critical scrutiny. The second is writing as articulation, understood as the disciplined practice of making tacit understanding explicit, subjecting implicit assumptions to critical scrutiny, and constructing publicly accountable reasoning. This dimension draws directly on Polanyi's (1966) account of tacit knowledge and on Vygotsky's (1986) understanding of written language as a demand for deliberateness and abstraction, and it finds pedagogical expression in approaches that ask writers to make their reasoning processes visible, to explain the inferential steps that connect evidence to conclusion, and to articulate the assumptions that underlie their arguments. The third is writing as revision, understood not merely as the correction of surface errors but as the epistemic practice of returning to one's own thinking with critical distance, recognising its limitations, and reconstructing it in more adequate forms. This dimension



resonates with Dewey's (1910) account of reflective thinking as a recursive and self-correcting process, and it finds pedagogical expression in approaches that treat revision as an intellectual rather than a cosmetic activity, requiring writers to interrogate the logic of their arguments, the adequacy of their evidence, and the consistency of their reasoning rather than simply improving the surface features of their prose.

These three dimensions are not sequential stages but mutually constitutive aspects of a single epistemic practice. A writer engaged in genuine academic inquiry moves continuously between them, generating ideas through exploratory writing, subjecting those ideas to the discipline of explicit articulation, and revising both the argument and the understanding that underlies it in the light of critical reflection. This account of writing development stands in sharp contrast to the linear, stage-based models that dominate writing instruction in English language education, and it points toward a fundamentally different set of pedagogical priorities.

The implications of this reorientation for curriculum design are substantial. If writing is understood as epistemic practice, then writing instruction cannot be confined to dedicated writing courses or language support classes but must be integrated into the full breadth of the curriculum, across disciplines and at every level of study. This is not an argument for the wholesale abandonment of explicit language instruction or genre pedagogy, both of which have demonstrable value, but for their repositioning within a broader pedagogical framework that places the development of epistemic agency at its centre. Writing tasks should be designed to require genuine intellectual engagement rather than the reproduction of established positions; feedback should attend to the quality of reasoning and the development of argument as well as to the accuracy of linguistic form; and assessment criteria should make space for the recognition of original intellectual contribution alongside formal competence. Carless (2015), whose work on feedback literacy in higher education has drawn attention to the conditions under which feedback supports genuine learning rather than mere performance improvement, argues that effective feedback is fundamentally dialogic, engaging students in a reflective conversation about their thinking rather than simply reporting evaluative judgements about their texts. This dialogic conception of feedback is entirely consistent with the epistemic writing pedagogy proposed in this paper, and it suggests that the reform of feedback practices is one of the most immediately practical levers available to educators seeking to promote epistemic agency in academic writing contexts.

The implications for the philosophical foundations of English language education are equally significant. The argument developed in this paper suggests that the field requires a more explicit and sophisticated engagement with the epistemological questions that underlie its central practices. What counts as knowledge in an academic writing context? Who is recognised as a legitimate epistemic agent? What forms of intellectual contribution are valued, and on what grounds? These are not merely theoretical questions but questions with direct practical consequences for the millions of multilingual learners who

engage with academic writing in English as part of their educational formation. A field that does not ask these questions explicitly is one that answers them implicitly, and the implicit answers embedded in current pedagogical practice are, as this paper has argued, philosophically inadequate and educationally harmful.

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of a purely theoretical inquiry of this kind. The argument advanced in this paper is constructed from philosophical and theoretical resources and has not been tested against the complexity and contingency of actual classroom practice. There is a genuine risk, well recognised in the philosophy of education literature, that theoretically elegant frameworks prove difficult to translate into pedagogical practice without significant loss of their defining features. The epistemic reorientation proposed here will require empirical investigation of its effects on writing development, teacher cognition, and learner experience before its practical value can be fully assessed. Furthermore, the paper has necessarily operated at a level of generality that cannot do full justice to the diversity of English language teaching contexts, learner populations, and institutional arrangements within which academic writing is taught and learned. These limitations are acknowledged not to diminish the significance of the theoretical contribution but to mark clearly the boundaries of what theoretical inquiry alone can achieve and to identify the empirical and applied work that must follow from it.

5. Conclusion

This paper has argued that academic writing in English is not, at its foundations, a technical or procedural competency but an epistemic practice through which knowledge is constituted, critical thinking is exercised, and intellectual agency is developed or suppressed. The argument has been constructed across three interconnected claims, each of which draws on philosophical and educational resources that are rarely brought into sustained dialogue within the existing literature. The first claim, grounded in the epistemological accounts of Polanyi (1966), Clark and Chalmers (1998), and the broader philosophy of mind, establishes that writing is a constitutive cognitive act rather than a representational one, a mode of knowing rather than a medium of reporting. The second claim, developed through engagement with Vygotsky (1986), Bakhtin (1986), and Dewey (1910), establishes that critical thinking is irreducibly linguistic and dialogic in character, inseparable from the specific discursive practices through which it is exercised in academic contexts. The third claim, informed by the critical perspectives of Canagarajah (2002), Hyland (2006), and Fricker (2007), establishes that prevailing approaches to academic writing pedagogy in English language education systematically marginalise the epistemic agency of learners, with consequences that are both educationally damaging and philosophically unjustifiable.

Together these claims support the broader argument for an epistemic reorientation in academic writing pedagogy, organised around the three constitutive dimensions of writing as inquiry, writing as articulation, and writing as revision. This



reorientation does not call for the rejection of existing contributions from genre theory, process approaches, or English for Academic Purposes research, all of which have generated genuine and valuable insights into the nature and development of academic writing. Rather, it calls for the repositioning of those contributions within a philosophical framework that places the writer as a knowing subject, rather than the text as a formal object, at the centre of pedagogical concern. Such a repositioning has far-reaching implications for how writing tasks are designed, how feedback is conceptualised, how assessment criteria are constructed, and how the relationship between language development and disciplinary learning is understood at the level of curriculum and institutional policy.

The contribution of this paper to the existing literature is twofold. At the level of philosophy of education, it provides a theoretically integrated account of the epistemic dimensions of academic writing that draws together strands of argument from epistemology, philosophy of language, and writing studies in ways that have not previously been systematically developed. At the level of English language education, it offers a principled philosophical basis for challenging the epistemological assumptions embedded in dominant pedagogical frameworks and for reconceptualising writing development as a process of intellectual formation rather than linguistic acquisition alone.

It is recognised that a theoretical contribution of this kind is necessarily incomplete. The framework proposed here requires empirical investigation of its applicability and effects across diverse English language teaching and learning contexts, learner populations, and institutional settings. Future research might productively examine how epistemic writing pedagogy functions in practice within specific disciplinary and multilingual contexts, how teachers conceptualise and negotiate the tension between epistemic and formal dimensions of writing instruction, and how learners themselves experience and articulate the relationship between writing and knowing in their academic development. These are questions that theoretical inquiry alone cannot answer, and they represent the most urgent agenda for empirical work that follows from the argument advanced in this paper. The relationship between writing and knowing is, ultimately, not only a philosophical question but a pedagogical one, and it is in the space between philosophy and practice that the most significant contributions to both fields remain to be made.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.; V. W. McGee, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
2. Ball, S. J. (2003). *The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity*. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093022000043065>
3. Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. University of Wisconsin Press.
4. Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
5. Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
6. Carless, D. (2015). *Excellence in university assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. Routledge.
7. Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
8. Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). *The extended mind*. *Analysis*, 58(1), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/analys/58.1.7>
9. Code, L. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge*. Cornell University Press.
10. Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)
11. Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. D. C. Heath and Company.
12. Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
13. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). *A cognitive process theory of writing*. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
14. Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.
15. Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Vol. 1. Reason and the rationalisation of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press. (Original work published 1981)
16. Hospers, J. (1997). *An introduction to philosophical analysis* (4th ed.). Routledge.
17. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
18. Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.
19. Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
20. Klein, P. D. (1999). *Reopening inquiry into cognitive processes in writing-to-learn*. *Educational Psychology Review*, 11(3), 203–270. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021913217147>
21. Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. Routledge.
22. Martin, J. R. (1993). *Genre and literacy: Modelling context in educational linguistics*. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 141–172. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500002440>
23. McPeck, J. E. (1981). *Critical thinking and education*. St. Martin's Press.
24. Menary, R. (2007). *Cognitive integration: Mind and cognition unbounded*. Palgrave Macmillan.
25. Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Longman.
26. Plato. (1995). *Phaedrus* (A. Nehamas & P. Woodruff, Trans.). Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published ca. 370 BCE)
27. Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Doubleday.
28. Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences: Essays on language, action and interpretation* (J. B. Thompson, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
29. Russell, D. R. (1991). *Writing in the academic disciplines, 1870–1990: A curricular history*. Southern Illinois University Press.
30. Rust, C., Price, M., & O'Donovan, B. (2003). *Improving students' learning by developing their understanding of assessment criteria and processes*. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(2), 147–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301671>



31. Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
32. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1935)
33. Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans., Rev. ed.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1934)