

Methodology in EAP: still an overlooked issue?

Douglas Bell



**University of
Nottingham**

UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA

University of Nottingham Ningbo China, 199 Taikang East Road, Ningbo, 315100, Zhejiang, China.

First published 2021

This work is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

The work is licenced to the University of Nottingham Ningbo China under the Global University Publication Licence:

<https://www.nottingham.edu.cn/en/library/documents/research/global-university-publications-licence-2.0.pdf>



**University of
Nottingham**

UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA

Methodology in EAP: still an overlooked issue?

Douglas Bell

Author correspondence e-mail: douglas.bell@nottingham.edu.cn

Orcid Account : <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4319-0380>

Abstract

In 2003 it was suggested that insufficient attention had been paid to methodology and pedagogy in EAP and that there had been an over-emphasis on the 'what' at the possible expense of the 'how'. While conferences and other professional events have gone some way towards addressing this issue, in terms of EAP journal outputs, as a survey of the Journal of English for Academic Purposes (JEAP) shows, not very much seems to have changed. The pages of JEAP still suggest a dearth of research interest in issues related to EAP methodology. This reflective paper argues that much greater prominence needs to be given to pedagogical matters in EAP, not least because teaching still accounts for the bulk of what most EAP practitioners do. The paper further suggests that the transfer of methodology and pedagogy from General ELT to EAP should be considered more critically than has hitherto been the case.

KEYWORDS: methodology; pedagogy; teaching approaches; transfer from ELT to EAP

Introduction

Writing some 18 years ago now, in the second edition of what was then the newly emerged Journal of English for Academic Purposes (JEAP), Richard Watson Todd (2003) suggested that the literature on EAP up until that time had been more concerned with the 'what' of EAP, i.e. its content, rather than the 'how', i.e. its teaching approaches and methodology. He duly went on to identify what he claimed were six specific pedagogical approaches to EAP, concluding his article with the argument that more emphasis should be placed on methodology in EAP, or as he chose to frame it, TEAP.

As I was a practicing EAP teacher at that time myself, the ideas that Todd had expressed resonated very strongly with me. I felt that his article was seminal in drawing attention to an area, which I also believed the mainstream journal literature had generally overlooked. Although there was certainly no shortage of research articles using genre analysis frameworks and techniques to examine the raw language of EAP texts (the 'what'), I very much agreed with Todd that there had been a noticeable lack of articles dealing with the ways in which individual teachers might actually approach the teaching of EAP in their classrooms (the 'how'). As the emergence of JEAP had arguably marked a major historical watershed in the development of EAP (we must remember that prior to its launch, there was no publication dedicated solely to EAP; most articles dealing with anything EAP-related had tended to appear in periodicals with a broader focus, such as *TESOL Quarterly*, the *English Language Teaching Journal* and the *Journal of English for Specific*

Purposes), in the wake of Todd's article, I was therefore eagerly anticipating more vigorous academic debate on the issues he had raised.

To my surprise, this largely seemed not to happen. With the exception of an article by Lynn Flowerdew in 2005, which explicitly referenced the points that Todd had made, it seemed that the issue of methodology in EAP had once again fallen off the radar screen. Re-examining matters from a contemporary perspective, I would argue that almost two decades on from Todd's publication, the pages of JEAP still seem to place more emphasis on the 'what' of EAP rather than the 'how'. True, when looking across the discipline as a whole, there have been several international conferences, various special interest group meetings and a few symposia over the intervening years, each of which have examined the role of the EAP practitioner and different aspects of practice (e.g. BALEAP 2017a; BALEAP 2017b; BALEAP 2016; BALEAP 2012). This interest has continued up to the present time (e.g. BALEAP 2021). However, as far as published journal articles go, very little seems to have changed.

Lest I am accused of overstating the case here and making an unfair criticism in my comments, I would invite readers to carry out keyword searches in JEAP under 'EAP methodology' or 'EAP pedagogy' and see what results this brings. Going through such a process recently myself, keyword searches generated 366 hits for the former and 442 for the latter. On the face of it, these returns seemed impressive, but looking at the results more closely told a very different story. Most of the articles do not in fact deal with methodology, nor classroom pedagogy, and it seems that these high-figure returns owe more to the inclusion of the acronym 'EAP' than matches against anything explicitly ¹methodological. When the keyword search results are considered from this perspective, then it soon becomes apparent that when categorizing EAP methodology and EAP pedagogy within the pages of JEAP anyway, pretty much anything can and does end up being thrown into the pot. While it is certainly not my intention here to attack the past or present editors of JEAP, nor to debate the efficacies of that journal's indexing mechanisms, I do nonetheless find it both puzzling and disappointing that in a field in which most of the practitioners are working as *teachers*, there is evidently such a dearth of professional research interest in the theory and practice of EAP *teaching*. As indeed Todd (2003: 154) had originally commented, it is almost as if the 'how' of EAP and methodological matters end up getting treated as an afterthought. Why might this be so?

To TEAP or not to TEAP? More than just a Rhetorical Question...

Perhaps one of the reasons for the apparent lack of research interest in EAP methodology could be framed as familiarity breeds contempt. After all, qualified teachers know how to teach, don't they, so why should they bother to talk about it? As Henry Widdowson (2003) has tartly commented:

Teaching is common sense; it's just like putting on your trousers. So why do we stand about disputing? Why waste time enquiring into the nature of language, the psychological process of learning, or the relative effectiveness of different approaches to teaching? If teaching is seen as commonsensical,

¹ Although I should acknowledge that a small number of articles do focus on EAP *research* methodology.

something that anybody can turn their hand to if they feel so disposed, then, of course, not much prestige attaches to it... This view of the language teacher is quite widespread, even among language teachers themselves... Once knowledge becomes common property, and common sense, its mystery disappears, and there is no need to hold it in special regard.

(Widdowson 2003: 1)

Aside from the potential damage that this does to the levels of professional respect afforded to teachers and teaching, the most obvious downside of such thinking is that it can all too easily lead us into not seeing the wood for the trees. The act of teaching then becomes an elephant in the (class)room; something that people are certainly aware of, but an activity that has itself become so commonplace, they have no desire to draw explicit attention to it. I must say that I find such a perspective troubling. As I have stated above, the fact of the matter is that classroom *teaching* is what occupies most EAP practitioners' time. Not language analysis; not linguistic research; not arguing for human rights, nor trying to re-shape the entire *raison d'être* of universities: the day-job for the majority of EAP professionals remains *teaching* classes of students how to operationalize the language and skills needed for academic purposes. It seems to me that for this reason alone, there should be *significantly* more professional interest shown in the '*how*' of EAP and what actually goes on in EAP classrooms.

Perhaps a second reason for the lack of interest is the misguided belief that everything that needs to be said about EAP teaching has been said already and there is no longer anything new. In this regard, some of the EAP literature may well be guilty of perpetuating a myth that more attention has been paid to methodological matters than is in fact the case. Writing in 2006, for example, in his advanced resource book for EAP, Ken Hyland confidently stated that both methods and materials had 'received considerable attention in the ELT and EAP literature... with methods taking precedence' (2006a: 89) but in the case of EAP certainly, this statement is very hard to substantiate. Hyland himself provides no supporting citations as evidence for his claim and apart from a brief mention of how corpora and computer-mediated learning might have an impact on what EAP teachers do, the bulk of his chapter in fact discusses EAP materials, *not* EAP methodology. More recent authors also appear to be in agreement that methodology in EAP has received a lot of attention (e.g. Breen, 2018: 3) although once again, I would challenge such a claim. While it is certainly true that methodology in General ELT has come under very close scrutiny, (e.g. Richards and Rodgers 2014; Waters 2012; Waters 2009; Hall 2011; Brown 2007) none of these debates have dealt with methodology specifically as it applies to EAP.

Having just acknowledged that methodology has received considerable attention in the mainstream ELT literature, at this juncture, it is perhaps worth revisiting what makes EAP different. The academic literature on the differences between EAP and General ELT is now extensive (Bell 2016; Argent and Alexander 2012; Campion 2012; Bell 2010; Sharpling 2002; Flowerdew and Peacock 2001; Hyland 2006b; Strevens 1988) although it might also be argued that different authors have chosen to highlight different features depending on their personal interests and biases. However,

there does seem to be a broad agreement that one of the key differentiating features between EAP and ELT in general is that teaching in EAP contexts should always be geared towards meeting particular needs. In this regard, EAP not surprisingly shares many similarities with the broader discipline of ESP, where an analysis of needs is widely recognized as being one of the core pillars upon which everything else then rests (Anthony 2018). Of course, one might also reasonably argue that there are *always* needs of some description and that previous writers may have been a little too hasty in assigning mainstream ELT to the so-called TENOR (Teaching English for No Obvious Reason) box (Abbott 1981). Lots of teaching in General ELT contexts is clearly also very much needs-based, so if we are to avoid falling into the trap of stereotyping and over-generalization, then some care does need to be taken when applying this particular yardstick. We would probably be on safer ground to say that in the case of EAP, it is simply that the *awareness* of teaching towards particular needs is much more acute. This central preoccupation with needs in EAP has several important ramifications for what then happens in practice. For a start, if teaching is to be directed towards the outcome of meeting particular needs, then it means that there will *de facto* be a greater sense of purpose and a heightened prioritization of what takes place in the classroom. Approaches and activities, which might serve language-learning purposes well in a broader and less-pressured environment, may now have to be discarded on the grounds that they are ‘nice to have’ rather than ‘need to have’. Another knock-on effect of teaching to meet specific needs is that the teaching itself will become more accountable and results driven; practitioners are also likely to become much pithier in their evaluations of what does and does not work well. As a further corollary of this, there will be a greater awareness of time and how best to use it. In sum, all of the above are consequences of teaching towards a particular set of needs and each has the potential to create additional sets of consequences when it comes to choosing appropriate methodology and pedagogical approaches.

Aside from the central positioning of needs, another widely accepted difference between EAP and ELT in general concerns the nature of the learners. As several authors have commented (Anthony 2018; de Chazal 2013; Alexander, Argent and Spencer 2008) learners in an EAP environment are typically adults, and as such, usually have more maturity, more personal agency and a greater sense of purpose. As adult learners, they are also not necessarily coming into the EAP classroom as a *tabula rasa*; as empty vessels waiting to be filled. In many EAP contexts, it is accepted that the learners will know far more about the content of their given subject discipline than the EAP practitioners teaching them (Anthony 2018). This has important ramifications for the inherent power balance in student-teacher relationships and may well mean that in some situations, teachers and students will need to work together on more of an equal partnership footing. Once again, this has important methodological consequences for the pedagogical approaches that teachers subsequently choose to take in their classrooms.

Methodological Considerations in EAP

In his 2003 article, Todd suggested that EAP places a particular emphasis on six pedagogical approaches:

1. focus on inductive learning;
2. using process syllabuses;
3. promoting learner autonomy;
4. using authentic materials and tasks;
5. integrating technology in teaching;
6. using team teaching.

18 years on from this listing, it is worth looking at these approaches again to see if anything has changed or needs refinement.

1. Focus on Inductive Learning

I think few would deny that EAP teaching tends to favour inductive approaches over deductive. Actively encouraging students to notice features of academic language and guiding their discovery of how different written genres operate both speak to an inductive learning process. This is not to say, of course, that deductive teaching and learning have no place in EAP. There are certainly instances when teachers may decide to provide their students with explicit ‘rules’, but I would agree with Todd that encouraging students to become adept at working things out for themselves is a methodological hallmark of the EAP classroom. This of course duly links well with point three, the promotion of learner autonomy.

2. Using Process Syllabuses

I will immediately nail my colours to the mast here and say that I personally find this one a little less clear cut. Perhaps my hesitation is caused by an awareness of some ambiguity around how we might wish to define a process syllabus. In its purest form, where learners and teachers negotiate the entire syllabus together, I am not so sure that this happens often enough to say that it is a key methodological component of EAP. Certainly, if I reflect on the last quarter century of my own career in EAP teaching, I would have to say that process syllabuses have not played as much of a role as the more commonly found product syllabus. Although there may sometimes be some leeway in negotiating the content and ordering of what is to be covered, I believe that in most cases, teachers still go into their classrooms with a largely pre-determined idea of what the EAP syllabus will contain. Within that broader framework however, there are undoubtedly aspects of a more process-based approach to pedagogy. EAP writing tasks, for example, are typically structured around process-based principles with students required to submit outlines, drafts and re-drafts before they hand in their final version. In this regard, I would agree with Todd that as a general principle in EAP, process does tend to be foregrounded somewhat more than product. Whether we can extend this claim as far as the EAP syllabus though, for me, remains open to debate.

3. Promoting Learner Autonomy

As with inductive learning, I think most EAP teachers would recognize the promotion of learner autonomy as an inherent pedagogical principle of EAP. Much of the early study skills dimension of EAP (e.g. Waters and Waters 1995) was certainly preoccupied with this goal and the

underpinnings of promoting learner autonomy still remain evident today in sessions such as how to use library resources or how to navigate online e-journals.

Many of the original tenets of genre analysis also speak to the promotion of autonomous learners, particularly the idea of training students in aspects of linguistic analysis so that they can become better-informed investigators and users of language in their own right. As John Swales (2019) has recently commented however, the pedagogical links between genre analysis models and their practical application in EAP classrooms have not always been made as explicit as they might have been. Given the ongoing interest in genre analysis and its role in EAP, it seems to me that the more *practical* application of its pedagogical principles still offers researchers considerable scope for investigation. Indeed, this may well turn out to be an area in which more journal contributions to the ‘how’ of EAP might yet be made.

4. Using Authentic Materials and Tasks

As EAP aims to prepare students for dealing with specific language and contexts and has its roots in Communicative Language Teaching, it should come as no surprise that authentic materials and tasks will feature prominently in its pedagogy. Teaching that is based on a target-situation needs analysis is certainly likely to throw up instances when students will find themselves exposed to the academic texts and language that they can expect to encounter in real academic life. As part of such EAP training, students are also likely to engage with authentic tasks. Taking notes from a lecture, doing a literature search, writing a discursive essay and giving an oral presentation are all examples of tasks, which are authentic for academic contexts. As several writers (e.g. Breen 1985; Widdowson 2003) have cautioned however, authenticity is a much more complex notion than it first might appear and EAP teachers should not assume that authenticity of materials alone will always be sufficient. While I would agree with Todd that using authentic materials and task-types is a core pedagogic feature of EAP, I would also argue that other considerations such as appropriateness and intended learning outcomes must also be kept in mind.

5. Integrating Technology in Teaching

To a greater or lesser extent, the integration of technology and teaching now seems to permeate almost every subject in the educational curriculum, so personally, I would hesitate to identify this a defining feature of EAP pedagogy. These days, the General English classroom is just as likely to draw on technological advances as EAP, although the latter still probably deals more with concordancing software packages and corpora. That said, rather like my point above regarding process syllabuses, with the possible exception of tools such as Moodle and Powerpoint, not all EAP teachers are necessarily going to be using CALL on a daily basis. For this reason, I would be reluctant to mark the integration of technology as a core pedagogical component of EAP. However, given the recent emergence of Covid-19 and the effects that it has had on traditional classroom delivery, this situation may well change. Indeed, the current worldwide need for online teaching of EAP and the various challenges that this has brought may force the development of new pedagogies. As with my comment about more practical applications of genre analysis, it is to be

hoped that the switch to online EAP and the emergence of any ensuing pedagogical issues will be duly reflected in future journal paper submissions.

6. Using Team Teaching

Todd's final claim that team-teaching is a distinctive pedagogical feature of EAP has always struck me as more aspirational than actual. While team-teaching in EAP certainly exists, particularly in CBI and CLIL environments, I am not so sure that it happens with sufficient frequency yet for it to be marked as a defining pedagogical hallmark of the discipline. In the ideal world, we certainly might *wish* for EAP classes to be delivered as a joint venture between subject specialists and language specialists, but in most of the current EAP teaching contexts that I am personally aware of this still tends to be the exception rather than the norm.

Beyond the six pedagogic approaches identified by Todd, are there any other distinctive features of EAP's methodology worthy of mention? In answering this question, it can be instructive to consider some of the methodological issues that have been of concern in the history of ELT in general.

As various authors agree (Richards and Rodgers 2014; Waters 2012; Hall 2011; Kumaravadivelu 2006; Adamson 2004; Prabhu 1990), the methodological development of ELT has been marked by several dichotomous pendulum swings. One of the earliest such swings concerned the role which should be played by the students' first language (L1). In the case of traditional grammar translation methodology, for example, it was held that all instruction should be delivered in the L1. The positioning on this then changed quite dramatically with the advent of alternative methodological approaches such as The Oral Approach, which argued for a complete avoidance of the L1, insisting instead that all instruction and classroom interaction should now be carried out only in the target language (L2). With very few exceptions, this approach has continued to be adopted by successive methodologies, particularly Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and of course, it still dominates at the present time. However, the recent emergent interest in translanguaging pedagogy (Rabidge 2019; Mazak 2017) marks a very interesting departure from this L2-only hegemony and may well have important pedagogical ramifications for the future teaching of EAP, particularly in the growing number of contexts where non-native speaker English teachers outnumber the natives.

A further methodological pendulum swing has concerned the roles of teachers and learners. In essence, the main thrust of the discussion here has revolved around whether classes should be teacher-centred or learner-centred. For anyone steeped in the doctrines of CLT, the most typical treatment of this particular dichotomy is for teacher-centred to be seen as something 'bad' and learner-centred to be seen as something 'good'. In the case of EAP, however, I would argue that things are often not quite so clear-cut. Indeed, I would even go so far as to say that in certain EAP teaching contexts, there may well be a considerable amount of teacher-centred instruction, certainly far more than would ordinarily be deemed permissible in the CELTA or DELTA classroom. However, for EAP teachers, I believe that the slaying of such sacred cows should not

be a cause for alarm. In this regard, as with the role of the L1, it is my view that several of the generally accepted methodological transfers from General ELT to EAP need to be considered rather more critically and not simply applied wholesale. If we are prepared to agree that EAP sometimes draws on a different knowledge base and set of competencies (BALEAP 2008), then I would argue that we must also sometimes question the extent to which these may need to be complemented by different pedagogical approaches.

The Legacies of TEFL- a plus or a minus for TEAP?

In the section above, I have made reference to methodological transfer from General ELT to EAP. I have also suggested that this matter should not be approached uncritically. While there clearly *are* some areas of useful pedagogical overlap between ELT and EAP, there are also some instances when the methodology found in the General English classroom may not in fact be the most appropriate or effective when applied to EAP (Flowerdew and Peacock 2001).

The reasons for me personally holding these views are largely attributable to a time from much earlier in my career which I spent serving as the Director of a very large EAP centre. A significant chunk of my annual workload during that period was spent ²observing and critically evaluating EAP teachers' classes. While taking part in such observations, a very common phenomenon that I noticed, particularly with the teachers who were new to EAP, was what I broadly perceived to be the uncritical transfer of General ELT pedagogies. This typically manifested itself in several different ways. Teachers with strong CLT backgrounds, for example, often spent a lot of time constantly re-arranging the class dynamics and having the students keep moving their physical locations and working in different groups. While there can undoubtedly sometimes be good pedagogical reasons for doing this, when challenged to explain why they were doing so as often as they did, teachers were typically unable to articulate any justification other than saying that frequent re-grouping of students was 'what teachers are supposed to do' and (more tellingly) that it was 'how they had been trained'. There were similar responses when it came to being strict about keeping individual activities within time boundaries and linking them to the accomplishment of specific objectives. For example, I often observed the scenario that as long as their students were talking, some teachers were happy to let exercises and activities run on, even though this would then prevent them from having sufficient time to achieve their other lesson aims. In the post-observation debriefings, when invited to discuss and justify such practices, teachers often stated that they felt it was a pity to stop their students if a given activity was working well, particularly if it seemed that the students were enjoying themselves. Such teachers also frequently commented that it was 'good to get the students talking'. In these cases, teachers evidently seemed to be prioritizing oral fluency, even on those occasions when the main aim of the class was supposed to be about developing students' reading or writing abilities. While there can be no absolutes in any of this, and I would readily agree that a large part of the craft we recognize as effective teaching involves teachers making their own independent judgment calls, after observing and discussing

² For a fuller discussion of this, see Bell (2021) and Bell (2010).

many instances of the above, I did start to wonder if the root cause for these teachers' behaviour might be traced to an over-enthusiastic application of 'traditional' CLT principles. Beyond the cases already mentioned, for example, the notion of pedagogical transfer seemed especially evident when it came to a fondness for games and what might loosely be termed 'affective activities' such as warmers. Teachers newly migrating to EAP from a background in General English teaching certainly seemed to be much more at home with these kinds of classroom techniques than the more seasoned EAPers, who tended to take a rather more serious and utilitarian approach to their lessons. Before I begin to sound like a killjoy, I should stress that I am absolutely *not* suggesting here that there is definitively no place for games or other affective activities in EAP. As Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 48) made clear over three decades ago, 'the medicine of relevance may sometimes need to be sweetened with the sugar of enjoyment, fun, creativity and a sense of achievement'. What I *am* proposing, however, is that whereas 'fun' activities in certain General English contexts often take centre stage and can sometimes appear to have been included simply for their own sake, in an EAP class, the primary consideration should be whether a chosen teaching activity or pedagogical approach is the most effective and efficient way to achieve specific outcomes. In other words, if games *are* to be employed in EAP, then there should be a clear pedagogical reason for doing so; they should not be happening purely for their entertainment value alone. As an extension of this point, I would very much agree with Alexander, Argent and Spencer (2008) who claim that when teaching in EAP contexts, 'the stakes for the student are high and the time is limited' (2018: 18). Whichever way we look at it, EAP is clearly a serious endeavour and I feel we owe it to our students to give them the best support possible. As Vivian Cook (2009) has pointed out, perhaps one of the unfortunate side-effects of CLT's emphasis on creating a more convivial classroom atmosphere is that, 'the measure of a good lesson for many teachers... is one where activities work and students are happy, with little tangible evidence that students have learnt anything' (Cook, 2009: 139).

Given that EAP still recruits the lion's share of its teachers from mainstream ELT backgrounds, the majority of whom are likely to have done most, if not all, of their prior qualifications and training in General English teaching, it should come as no surprise that there will be issues around pedagogical transfer when teachers migrate from one to the other. Certainly from my own personal experience (Bell 2007), teachers moving from General English to EAP do typically find themselves on a steep initial learning curve and reports from the wider literature tend to bear this observation out (Elsted 2012; Post 2010; Ding, Jones and King 2004). It also now seems clear that the move from General ELT to EAP is often likely to involve a certain amount of unlearning and this can leave teachers feeling that the pedagogical rug has been pulled out from under them. In some cases, the transition from one milieu to the other can be deeply unsettling for teachers and may involve a re-thinking of practice and identity. As Olwyn Alexander (2009) has blogged:

They talk about feeling 'deskilled' because it seems to them that their previous experiences of English teaching are no longer required in EAP. They worry about being able to understand the ideas and texts in the disciplines their students are entering.

(Alexander 2009 cited in Post 2010: 26)

As long as the situation remains that teachers are recruited for EAP teaching when their previous experience and qualifications are grounded in the principles of General ELT, this sense of initially feeling ‘deskilled’ is likely to persist. As several writers have pointed out (e.g. Sharpling 2002; Krzanowski 2001; Errey 2001; Scott 2001) the standard qualifications in ELT do not necessarily prepare teachers for what they may be faced with when working in EAP. The obvious solution, of course, is for there to be a more efficient means of training and developing those with ELT backgrounds in the more specific knowledge and skill areas deemed necessary for EAP. A bridging process like this would presumably help to make the transition from one discipline to the other much smoother and allow new teachers to ‘hit the ground running’, rather than having to go through a trial and error adjustment period. As I have argued at length elsewhere (Bell 2010; Bell 2007), it does seem to me that in the case of EAP, more often than not, new teachers spend a significant amount of their time picking up the requisite EAP knowledge and skills through a process of enforced on-the-job learning, rather than via anything more carefully planned and systematic. While there are some benefits to learning things as one goes and some may see this as a natural stage in joining a community of practice (Wenger 1998; Lave and Wenger 1991), it is not necessarily the most efficient means. It is therefore my strong personal belief that anything which can make the transition process from ELT to EAP more streamlined and less unsettling for teachers must surely be for the greater good. This was certainly the thinking behind the development of the University of Plymouth’s Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching EAP (PgC TEAP) in 2005. This was the first UK-based course of its kind at that time and my English Language Centre colleagues and I were keen to create a credit-rated university-recognized qualification, which would help to prepare teachers experienced in General ELT for the realities of employment in EAP. As one of the core modules on the course involved a period of intensive EAP teaching practice and lesson observation, our intention was to provide teachers with what we hoped would be a judicious mix of theory, practice and critical reflection. Although the University of Plymouth PgC TEAP has long since been relegated to the history books (sadly, the course folded the year after I left Plymouth’s employment to explore professional pastures new- see Bell (2007; 2005) for a fuller description) I believed then, and I still believe now, that there remains an important role for such EAP-specific qualifications to play. While a detailed discussion of this topic falls beyond the scope of this present paper, recent research (Lowton 2020) supports the idea that EAP employers are continuing to welcome the development of such courses, although it must also be said that important questions remain around aspects of their ownership, delivery mechanisms and professional regulation. However, if more recognized preparatory training and professional development courses in EAP *are* developed, particularly those that involve a teaching observation and practice component, then one might confidently expect that some of the gaps between ELT pedagogy and EAP pedagogy that this paper has been discussing will be significantly narrowed. In the meantime, the development of more systematic approaches to EAP teacher induction programmes (e.g. O’Sullivan 2012) during which the pedagogical differences between ELT and EAP can be explicitly highlighted are to be encouraged and applauded.

Conclusion

In this short reflective paper, I have suggested that classroom methodology and practical pedagogical matters in EAP deserve to be given much more attention in the field's professional research journal literature than has hitherto been the case. I have also argued that some of the differences between General ELT and EAP should be considered a little more critically when it comes to the practical applications of classroom pedagogy. I very much hope that current readers will rally to these calls for action and that in the coming months and years, we will finally start to witness the same levels of professional interest in the 'how' of EAP, as we currently do in the 'what', just as indeed Richard Watson Todd had argued for almost two decades ago.

References

- Abbott, G. (1981). Encouraging communication in English: a paradox. *ELT Journal*, 35(3), 228-230.
- Alexander, O. (2012). Exploring teacher beliefs in teaching EAP at low proficiency levels. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 11, 99-111.
- Alexander, O. (2009). Understanding EAP context-Teaching English Blog. <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/blogs/olwyn-alexander/understanding-eap-context> In D. Post (2010) *The transition from teaching General English to English for Academic Purposes: an investigation into the challenges encountered by teachers*. MA diss., University of Bath, UK.
- Alexander, O. (2004). Groping in the dark or turning on the light: routes into teaching English for academic purposes. In T. Lynch and J. Northcott (eds.), *Educating legal English specialists and teacher education in teaching EAP. Proceedings of IALS teacher education symposia 2004 and 2006*. Edinburgh: Institute for Applied Language Studies, University of Edinburgh.
- Anthony, L. (2018). *Introducing English for Specific Purposes*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Argent, S. and Alexander, O. (2012). English for academic purposes: how is it different from other types of ELT? Retrieved from <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/seminars>
- BALEAP (2021). Exploring Pedagogical Approaches in EAP Teaching. University of Glasgow, Scotland. (Biennial Conference).
- BALEAP. (2017a). The EAP Practitioner in the Academy- A Watershed Moment? (EAP in the North Symposium)
- BALEAP. (2017b). Knowledge and the EAP Practitioner: a symposium. (BALEAP ResTES)
- BALEAP. (2016). Practitioner Identity: Managing Transitions to Scholarship (BALEAP ResTES)
- BALEAP (2012). The EAP Practitioner: Competencies and controversies. Durham University. (Professional Interest Meeting (PIM))
- BALEAP. (2008). Competency Framework for Teachers of English for Academic Purposes. Retrieved from <http://www.baleap.org.uk/teap/teap-competency-framework.pdf>

- Bell, D.E. (2021). Establishing Systems & Processes for Classroom Observation of Teaching in EAP. In P. Knight (ed). *EAP for the 21st Century. The UNNC Impact*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Bell, D.E. (2018). The Practice of EAP in Australia: A Rose by Any Other Name? In L.T. Wong and W.L.H. Wong (eds.), *Teaching and Learning English for Academic Purposes Current Research and Practices* (pp 161-177). New York: Nova Science Publications.
- Bell, D.E. (2016). Practitioners, pedagogies and professionalism in English for Academic Purposes (EAP): The development of a contested field. Ph.D diss., University of Nottingham, UK.
- Bell, D.E. (2013). The Enduring Legacy of TEFL: Help or Hindrance in Teaching EAP? Paper presented at the BALEAP biennial conference, *The Janus Moment in EAP: Revisiting the Past & Building the Future*, University of Nottingham, UK.
- Bell, D. E. (2010). Benchmarking Practitioner Expertise in the Teaching of EAP. Paper presented at joint conference IATEFL English for Specific Purposes SIG and Bilkent University School of English Language Faculty Academic English Program. *English for Academic Purposes in University Settings: Teacher and Learner Competencies*. Ankara, Bilkent University, Turkey.
- Bell, D.E. (2007). Moving Teachers from the General to the Academic: Challenges & Issues in Teacher Training for EAP. In T. Lynch and J. Northcott (eds.), *Educating legal English specialists and teacher education in teaching EAP. Proceedings of IALS teacher education symposia 2004 and 2006*. Edinburgh: Institute for Applied Language Studies, University of Edinburgh.
- Bell, D.E. (2005). Storming the Ivory Tower. *ELT Gazette*, June Issue. p7.
- Blaj-Ward, L. (2014). *Researching contexts, practices and pedagogies in English for academic purposes*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Breen, M.P. (1985) Authenticity in the Language Classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 60-70.
- Breen, P. (2018) *Developing Educators for the Digital Age. A Framework for Capturing Knowledge in Action*. London: University of Westminster Press.
- Brown, H.D. (2007) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 5th edition. New York: Longman.
- Bruce, I. (2011). *Theory and concepts of English for academic purposes*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Campion, G. (2015). What is required to teach EAP? Retrieved from <https://teachingeap.wordpress.com/2015/05/30/what-is-required-to-teach-eap/>
- Campion, G. (2012). ‘The learning never ends’: Investigating teachers’ experiences of moving from English for General Purposes to English for Academic Purposes in the UK context; What are the main challenges associated with beginning to teach EAP, and how can these challenges be overcome? Unpublished MA dissertation. University of Nottingham, UK.
- Cook, V. (2009). Developing links between second language acquisition and foreign language teaching. In K. Knapp, & B. Seidlhofer (eds.), *Handbook of foreign language communication and learning* (pp. 139–162). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- De Chazal, E. (2013). *English for Academic Purposes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ding, A. and Bruce, I. (2017). *The English for Academic Purposes Practitioner. Operating on the Edge of Academia*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Ding, A., Jones, M., and King, J. (2004) Perfect match? Meeting EAP teachers' needs and expectations in training. Presentation to BALEAP Professional Issues Meeting, Teacher Training in EAP, University of Essex, UK.

Elsted, F.J. (2012). An investigation into the attitudes and attributes that can support teachers in their transition from General English to English for Academic Purposes. Unpublished MA diss., University of Essex, UK.

Errey, L. (2001). EAP teacher training: how specialised is it? *EL Gazette*, October edition.

Flowerdew, L. (2005). Integrating traditional and critical approaches to syllabus design: the 'what', the 'how' and the 'why?' *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 4, 135-147.

Flowerdew, J. and Peacock, M. (eds.) (2001). *Research Perspectives on English for Academic Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hadley, G. (2015). *English for Academic Purposes in Neoliberal Universities: A Critical Grounded Theory*. New York: Springer International Publishing Switzerland.

Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English Language Teaching. Language in Action*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Hutchinson, T. and Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes. A Learning-centred Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2006a). *English for Academic Purposes an advanced resource book*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Hyland, K., (2006b). 'English for Specific Purposes: Some Influences and Impacts.' In J. Cummins and C. Davison (eds.) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*, (pp.379-390). Springer International Handbooks.

Krzanowski, M. (2001). S/he holds the Trinity/UCLES Diploma: Are they ready to teach EAP? Retrieved from www.baleap.org.uk/pims/pimreports/2001/bath/krzanowski.htm

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mazak, C.M. (2017). *Translanguaging in Higher Education: Beyond Monolingual Ideologies*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

O'Sullivan, S. (2012) Bringing the TEAP Competencies Framework into pre-sessional teacher induction: Which bits to focus on? Presentation delivered at the BALEAP Professional Interest Meeting (PIM) 'The EAP Practitioner: Competencies and Controversies'. Durham University, UK.

Lowton, R. (2020). The (T)EAP of the Iceberg: The Role of Qualifications in Teaching English for Academic Purposes. Unpublished MA TESOL diss., University of Nottingham Ningbo China, China.

Post, D. (2010). The transition from teaching General English to English for Academic Purposes: an investigation into the challenges encountered by teachers. Unpublished MA diss., University of Bath, UK.

Prabhu, N.S. (1990). There is no best method- why? *TESOL Quarterly* 24(2), 161-176.

- Rabagge, M. (2019). *Translanguaging in EFL Contexts: a call for change*. London: Routledge.
- Scott, M. (2001). "Is an ELT training good enough for EAP?" *EL Gazette*, Sept edition.
- Sharpling, G. (2002) Learning to Teach English for Academic Purposes: Some current training and development issues. *ELTED*, 6, 82-94.
- Strevens, P. (1988). ESP after 20 years: A reappraisal. In M. Tickoo (ed.) *ESP: State of the Art* (pp 1-13). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Todd, R.W. (2003). EAP or TEAP? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2, 147-156.
- Waters, A. (2012). Trends and Issues in ELT methods and methodology. *ELT Journal* 66(4), 440- 449. doi:10.1093/elt/ccs038
- Waters, A. (2009) Ideology in Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 30(1), 138-143. doi:10.1093/applin/amp005
- Waters, A. and Waters, M. (1995). *Study Tasks in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.