RESEARCH ARTICLE

Multimodality in EAP Objectives and Coursebooks

Hatice Sezgin

Selcuk University, Turkey / Contact: h.sezgin@selcuk.edu.tr

Abstract
Academic discourse is complex and dense regarding the information it conveys by nature. This complexity requires more effective ways of communication, which is possible by utilizing different modes of meaning– in other words, multimodality. English for Academic Purposes (EAP) aims to prepare learners for the academic discourse that they will be exposed to during their studies. Accordingly, multimodality has become one of the skills learners require to develop during their EAP experiences. This study attempts to reveal how much multimodality is included in EAP objectives and practices. For that purpose, target skills defined for academic English by the Global Scale of English (GSE) (Pearson, 2019) are analyzed to study the multimodal aspect of objectives. For the practice aspect, the tasks in two EAP course books are analyzed using a qualitative approach. The results of the analyses revealed that the use of multiple modes is set as an objective skill for EAP learners within the descriptors of GSE, especially for academic speaking, and this expectation is reflected within the tasks designed in EAP coursebooks. These findings are in agreement with the assumption that multimodality is considered a necessity for academic contexts and, therefore, EAP.

https://doi.org/10.47216/literacytrek.1279935

Keywords
Academic literacy,
EAP,
GSE,
Multimodality
Submission date
09.04.2023
Acceptance date
05.06.2023

Introduction

Although the concept of literacy has gained a much wider scope in recent years, what it refers to in its most basic sense is limited to the written mode of semiotics, which is the study of signs or how meaning is constructed through signs in the broadest sense (Chandler, 2022). From a historical perspective, literacy refers to the ability to code and encode or comprehend, process, and produce written symbols (Perry, 2012). To put it simply, it is the ability to read and write. However, with the development of technologies and our lives becoming increasingly digital, the amount and variety of semiotic resources we are exposed to have increased dramatically. These resources also undergo similar processes of coding and encoding as written ones, which raises the question of defining competence in achieving this with other modes. Changes in understanding the concept of literacy occurred mostly between the early 1970s and

the early 1990s (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011). The concepts of functional literacy and illiteracy are used to distinguish between people who can and cannot make use of their ability to read and write functionally (UNESCO, 1979). Since then, the concept of literacy has been used in many different areas, pairing up with new concepts such as media literacy, digital literacy, and computer literacy, mostly referring to the ability to function in a specific field (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011). Among many different types of literacies identified in different fields, this study focuses on the "academic literacy." As more ways of meaning-making are included in our lives with technological developments, pedagogical approaches focus on the methods of adapting learners to make use of these ways in their meaning-making processes. Therefore, multimodality, making use of multiple modes of meaning, inevitably turns out to be one of the skills on which EAP objectives and practices focus.

Literature Review

English for Academic Purposes

With the ever-developing global status of English and the worldwide trend towards the internationalization of higher education (Macaro et al., 2018), the prevalence of English Medium Instruction (EMI) has been rapidly increasing in many parts of the world (Dearden, 2014). EMI is the instructional use of English by an audience whose first language is not English (Pecorari & Malström, 2018). As speakers of languages other than English, this audience requires a certain level of readiness before starting the courses offered through EMI. English for Academic Purposes (EAP), which refers to the teaching of English with a focus "on the specific communicative needs and practices of particular groups in academic contexts" (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002, p. 2), serves to provide learners with that readiness in academic discourse. In the broadest sense, English for Academic Purposes (EAP), as a sub-domain of English Language teaching, is the practice of teaching English aiming to provide learners with the specific language skills they will need in their studies and research activities (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001). Providing a more specific definition, Hyland (2006a) defines EAP as the "specialized English-language teaching grounded in the social, cognitive and linguistic demands of academic target situations, providing focused

instruction informed by an understanding of texts and the constraints of academic contexts" (p. 2). He suggests that with an aim covering the language use in academic contexts for all levels, it makes use of various tools to provide learners with an understanding of "the structures and meanings of spoken, written, visual and electronic academic texts" (p.2). Research has proven the significance of EAP for academic success among non-native speakers of English (Rose et al., 2019; Terraschke & Wahid, 2011), which means that the better EAP courses are at providing learners with proficiency in academic discourse, the better they will be in academic literacy. Therefore, the attention paid to EAP increases in line with the prevalence of EMI.

Academic literacy and academic genres

The concept of academic literacy/literacies comes from New Literacy Studies (Turner, 2012). Initially, it was defined within the scope and reading and writing skills that higher education students have and use while reading and researching in their fields of study (Lea & Street, 1998). However, the developments leading to diverse modes in resources, and expanding the scope of literacy, have had the same impact on the concept of academic literacies, which encompasses multiple skills and modes in academic studies (Lea, 2004). These skills cover but are not limited to "critical thinking, database searching, familiarity with academic conventions such as referencing, use of formal register and the ability to manipulate a range of academic genres" (McWilliams & Allan, 2014, p. 1).

As proposed by Marius (1990), the purpose of academic discourse is to define disciplines and present evidence supporting those disciplines, along with the associations between the existing evidence of various sorts. However, different disciplines have different approaches to knowledge and research, which makes academic discourse rather varied in terms of how it is produced, especially by the subject field it is for (Hyland, 2016). Many studies have been conducted on the variance in academic discourse across disciplines, focusing on both written (Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2021; Hyland, 2006b; Parodi, 2015; Samraj, 2008) and spoken (Kashiha & Heng, 2014; Simpson-Vlach, 2006; Yang, 2014) discourse, all reporting the existence of differences in certain genres of academic discourse between different fields of study. The variation is not only at the lexical or structural level. As

stated by Duff (2010, p. 169), "Academic discourse socialization is a dynamic, socially situated process that in contemporary contexts is often multimodal, multilingual, and highly intertextual as well."

Multimodality

The concept of multimodality was introduced in the literature in the late 1990s, which is comparatively recent, yet still it has been a widely studied subject of academic research (Jewitt et al., 2016). Technological developments enabled the creation of multimodal texts enriched with different semiotic resources, including audio and visual modes, along with others. These developments facilitated the emergence of new multimodal genres for many different discourse communities, and the academy was no exception to this (Gotti et al., 2012).

As the name suggests, it makes use of multiple modes, which was defined within the scope of discourse as "the medium in which language is used between two or more people in a particular situation, such as written, spoken, face to face, telephone, or via the Internet" (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 371). As this definition suggests, making use of a range of different modes and forming them in a social and cultural manner to convey the meaning more effectively (Bezemer & Kress, 2008) is the basis of multimodality, which is a common feature of academic genres.

The importance of multimodality for EAP pedagogies has been put forward in the literature, though not widely. Archer (2022) discusses that multimodal approaches can enable EAP learners to become creative in their meaning-making processes. Similarly, O'Halloran et al. (2016) emphasize the importance of multimodal pedagogies for learners of academic discourse "for enhancing students' capacities for understanding and producing texts that employ and integrate a range of modalities" (p. 257). Having conducted a genre-based needs analysis for EAP classes, Molle and Prior (2012) report that academic genres are multimodal both in process and form, yet the search for the related literature doesn't produce many results for studies revealing how the multimodal aspect of academic discourse is reflected on EAP objectives and coursebooks. One study conducted by Fontenelle (2013) compares engineering textbooks and EAP coursebooks in terms of the co-occurrence of verbal and visual modes of meaning making and concludes that although EAP coursebooks include

some multimodal representations, they fail to reflect the complexity required by engineering.

Taking the multimodal nature of academic genres and the purpose of EAP, along with the lack of research revealing how this is reflected in the classroom as presented above into consideration, the present paper aims at investigating the practical aspect of EAP in terms of multimodality. With this purpose, it offers an analysis of the Global Scale of English (GSE) Learning Objectives for Academic English (Pearson, 2019), focusing on the different modes learners are expected to make effective use of once they achieve the levels of proficiency defined by the descriptors. Additionally, the speaking tasks assigned to learners in two EAP coursebooks are included in the analysis to see the different modes learners are expected to employ as they produce for the requirements of the courses. For that purpose, the paper seeks answers to the following questions:

1. Which modes of meaning-making are EAP learners expected to employ as they master different levels of proficiency in four language skills as defined by the descriptors of GSE?
2. Which of these modes of meaning-making defined within GSE are reflected in the tasks designed by two EAP coursebooks analyzed for the present research?

Method

The Data

Global Scale of English for Academic English

"The Global Scale of English (GSE) is a standardized, granular scale which measures English language proficiency. Unlike some other frameworks which describe attainment in broad bands, the Global Scale of English identifies what a learner can do at each point on the scale across speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills." (Pearson, 2019, p. 4). What is basically meant in this sentence with 'some other frameworks' is the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), on which the GSE is based. Unlike the CEFR, which serves a *common* framework for all languages and defines language proficiency on six broad levels from A1 to C2, the GSE is specific to English language and defines English language

proficiency on a scale from 10 to 90, which is aligned with the CEFR. With the concern that too broad definitions provided in the CEFR may vary depending on many factors, such as age and native language, the GSE was created to offer a "more granular definition of language proficiency" (p. 5), with 'Can Do Statements' some of which are directly from the CEFR. The GSE Learning Objectives for Academic English includes a total of 1255 descriptors, 449 of which are specific to Academic English. The numbers of items in each level for four skills are presented in Table 1. The present study focuses on these 449 objectives.

Table 1. Distribution of descriptors by level

	Reading		Listening		Speaking		Writing	
Level	EAP	All	EAP	All	EAP	All	EAP	All
GSE 10–21/Below A1	0	7	0	15	0	32	0	5
GSE 22–29/A1	0	14	0	32	0	54	0	19
GSE 30–35/A2	0	16	0	16	0	73	0	18
GSE 36–42/A2(+)	2	20	1	18	0	57	0	29
GSE 43–50/B1	10	27	5	25	8	59	12	42
GSE 51–58/B1(+)	16	32	21	45	20	73	25	62
GSE 59–66/B2	19	36	15	40	14	85	23	65
GSE 67–75/B2(+)	34	57	29	47	24	72	40	66
GSE 76–84/C1	30	37	18	30	28	52	33	49
GSE 85–90/C2	4	10	2	4	4	10	8	13
TOTAL	115	256	91	272	98	567	141	368

Coursebooks

Two advanced level (C1-C2) EAP coursebooks were included in the analysis of the present study. The first 'Prism Listening and Speaking 4' is from a mainstream publisher, Cambridge University Press (Williams, 2017). With the claim of "a fresh approach to EAP," Prism focuses on developing students' academic skills with an emphasis on critical thinking and academic vocabulary for both receptive and productive skills with a series of ten books on paired skills of 'Reading and Writing' and 'Listening and Speaking' on five levels from A1 to C1 level (Cambridge University Press & Assessment, n.d.). The final Listening and Speaking book of the series consists of eight units, and at the end of each unit, there is a 'Speaking Task', and these eight tasks are included in the analysis.

The second is 'The Compass: Route to Academic Success' is from a Turkish publisher, specifically chosen from a Turkish publisher to offer a national perspective. Written by the academicians of a reputable Turkish university, Middle East Technical University, the book is targeted at EAP students aiming at meeting their needs through tasks designed to improve their speaking skills for academic contexts (Duzan & Yalcin, 2019). The five tasks in this book were included in the analysis as well.

Data Analysis

In order to have an understanding of the multimodal aspect of EAP, the present research employs a mixed-methods design for qualitative and quantitative approaches. First, GSE descriptors and two EAP coursebooks were examined for the existence of multimodal tasks through document analysis, which is a qualitative analysis method. Bowen (2009) defines document analysis as "a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents" (p. 27) and recommends some approaches for analyzing documents, such as thematic or content analysis. The latter, defined by Bowen (2009) as categorizing the information included in the documents in accordance with the research questions, fits the purpose of the present research better. Bowen (2009) also suggests that the evidence for the question at hand-multimodality of EAP in our case-should be sought from at least two different sources of data. For this reason, the present study analyses both descriptors in GSE and tasks in two EAP coursebooks. Then, the number of tasks with a multimodal aspect, along with the modes included within, are presented for each skill in GSE and each task in the coursebooks.

The documents were analyzed on MAXQDA 2020, and the different modes included in the descriptors in the GSE and the 13 tasks from two EAP textbooks were coded with this software. The coding procedure focused on keywords for five different modes of meaning defined by The New London Group (Cazden et al., 1996) as: Audio, Spatial, Gestural, Visual and Linguistic. The keywords were also selected based on the definitions offered by The New London Group (Cazden et al., 1996) for these modes of meaning. Taken that four language skills the descriptors are defined for focus on two modes of discourse as written (reading and writing skills) and spoken (speaking and listening skills) any keyword indicating the use of an additional

mode was taken as a sign of multimodality, such as the inclusion of visuals in a spoken task.

As recommended by Neuendorf (2017) for reliability, a minimum amount of 10% of the data (50 of 449 descriptors: 10 for listening and speaking, 15 for reading and writing each, and two of the 13 tasks) was analyzed by two coders, who came to a full agreement in terms of the modes present in descriptors and tasks.

Findings

To answer the first research question related to the different modes EAP learners are expected to employ as they master different levels of proficiency in four language skills, different modes included in the 449 descriptors specific to Academic English in the GSL were analyzed. The descriptors and the modes they employ are presented in tables based on four skills. The descriptors which require the use of multiple modes are listed in Appendix 1.

Table 2. GSE EAP Reading Objectives

Level	n of items	written	w+ visual
A2+	2	2	0
B1	10	9	1
B1+	21	19	2
B2	19	18	1
B2+	33	33	0
C1	30	30	0
C2	4	4	0

As presented in Table 2, four of the 115 descriptors for EAP reading, only four of them require employing of two modes. Two descriptors for B1+ level and one descriptor for each of B1 and B2 levels include visual mode along with the written mode.

Table 3. GSE EAP Listening Objectives

Level	n of items	spoken	s+ visual	s+ intonation	s+ written
A2+	1	0	0	0	1
B1	5	4	0	1	0
B1+	21	20	0	0	1
B2	15	12	2	1	0
B2+	29	27	0	1	1
C1	18	15	1	0	2
C2	2	2	0	0	0

As presented in Table 3, 11 of the 91 descriptors defined for EAP listening skill in the GSL require the use of multiple modes. Three of these covered visuals, three intonation, and five written modes in addition to the spoken mode.

Table 4. GSE EAP Speaking Objectives

Level	n of items	spoken	s+ written+ visual	s+ visual	s+ written
B1	8	6	0	2	0
B1+	20	17	0	3	0
B2	14	12	0	1	1
B2+	24	19	1	2	2
C1	28	25	0	3	0
C2	4	4	0	0	0

As presented in Table 4, 15 of the 98 descriptors defined for EAP speaking includes employing multiple modes. One of these from B2+ level requires making use of both written and visual modes in addition to spoken, 11 include visual and 3 include written mode in addition spoken mode.

Table 5. GSE EAP Writing Objectives

Level	n of items	written	w+ symbol	w+ visual	w+ spoken
B1	12	11	0	0	1
B1+	24	19	1	2	2
B2	23	17	3	3	0
B2+	39	35	1	1	2
C1	33	29	2	0	2
C2	8	8	0	0	0

As presented in Table 5, 20 of the 141 descriptors defined for EAP writing in the GSE are multimodal. Seven of these include symbols, six include visual and seven include spoken mode in addition to written modes.

To answer the second research question, instructions for 13 speaking tasks from two EAP coursebooks were analyzed in terms of the different modes, students are expected to employ as they perform the activity. The findings are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Different modes required by speaking tasks in EAP coursebooks

Task	Spoken	Intonation	Body	Written	Visual	Total n of Modes
Compass1	X				X	2
Compass2	X			X	X	3
Compass3	X			X		2
Compass4	X		X	X	X	4
Compass5	X			X	X	3
Prism1	X			X		2
Prism2	X			X		2
Prism3	X			X	X	3
Prism4	X			X		2
Prism5	X	X	X	X	X	5
Prism6	X		X	X		3
Prism7	X	X	X	X		4
Prism8	X			X		2

As presented in Table 6, all 13 speaking tasks analyzed for the present study require students to employ at least one more mode in addition to spoken mode. The additional modes students are expected to make use of as they perform the speaking tasks are stress and intonation, body language, written texts and visuals like graphs, charts, and pictures.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present paper aims at investigating EAP learning objectives in terms of multimodality. With this purpose, the descriptors in the GSE Objectives for Academic English, and 13 speaking tasks from two advanced level EAP coursebooks were analyzed in terms of the modes used for meaning making. According to the findings, in addition to written and spoken modes, the GSE for Academic English expect learners to make use of stress and intonation, visuals and symbols to convey meaning as they achieve the objectives defined for different levels of proficiency. Although the number of descriptors, namely 'Can do statements' requiring multimodality is not very high in receptive skills of Reading (4 out of 115) and Listening (11 out of 91), the number of items was higher for productive skills of Speaking (15 out of 98) and Writing (20 out of 141). Especially for speaking, the use of visuals is encouraged to enrich the meaning conveyed to the counterparts. Another finding of the present paper is that all speaking tasks in two EAP coursebooks analyzed for the present study required multimodality. This finding is an indicator that multimodality is considered a must for academic contexts, as the purpose of EAP is to prepare learners for academia. The instructions given for the tasks in the coursebooks specifically indicate that learners should make use of four or five different modes to achieve the given tasks, but of course, it can be deduced that additional modes not specifically described by the instructions are also expected from learners. For instance, intonation was included in only two of the tasks, and the necessity for the use of body language was stated in only four of the 13 tasks analyzed. Yet, considering that these two coursebooks are targeted at advanced learners of EAP at C1-C2 levels, there is no strict need for a specific statement in the instructions, as they should already be aware of the importance of these aspects in spoken communication.

These findings support the arguments provided above that multimodality is an important aspect of EAP. As Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002) stated, since visual and other semiotic resources are claiming more ground in the academic discourse, EAP practitioners are "required to understand and translate the progressively more complex interactions between verbal and non-verbal features of academic texts." (p. 8). Accordingly, it is important that EAP instructors should be aware of this and include multimodality in every part of the courses as they prepare their students for their academic lives. The same goes for EAP course designers and coursebook publishers. In his highly cited textbook, Hyland (2006a) also mentions the need for a more research-informed basis for EAP courses since EAP "textbooks too often continue to depend on the writer's experience and intuition rather than on systematic research." (p. 5). Although Hyland's claim dates back almost two decades, it still seems to have some merit. Therefore, there is a need for further studies focusing on the realization of reflecting the multimodal features of academic discourse on EAP courses and coursebooks so that EAP can function in parallel with its objective in terms of providing learners with readiness for academic discourse.

Ethics committee permission information

Ethical approval is not applicable, because this article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects.

References

Archer, A. (2022). A multimodal approach to English for academic purposes in contexts of diversity. *World Englishes, 41,* 545– 553. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12600

Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: an introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy.* Parlor Press.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Cazden, C., Cope, B., Fairclough, N., Gee, J., Kalantzis, M., Kress, G., Luke, A., Luke, C., Michaels, S. & Nakata, M. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, *66*(1), 60-92.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment (n.d.). *Prism.* Available at: https://www.cambridge.org/us/cambridgeenglish/catalog/english-academic-purposes/prism

Chandler, D. (2022). *Semiotics: The basics* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction-a growing global phenomenon*. British Council. Available at: https://www.britishcouncil.es/sites/default/files/british_council_english_as_a_medium_of_instruction.pdf

Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. (2021). Engaging with the reader in research articles in English: Variation across disciplines and linguacultural backgrounds. *English for Specific Purposes, 63*, 18-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.02.003

Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 169-192. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048

Duzan, C. & Yalcin, E. (2019). *The Compass: Route to academic success*. Nuans Publishing.

Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). *Research perspectives on English for Academic Purposes*. Cambridge University Press.

Fontenelle, R. (2013). Engineering English: A multimodal case study of one Engineering and two EAP textbooks [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Carleton University.

Gotti, M., Berkenkotter, C., & Bhatia, V. K. (2012). Introduction. In C. Berkenkotter, V. K. Bhatia & M. Gotti (Eds.) *Insights into Academic Genres* (pp. 9-28). Peter Lang.

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

Hyland, K. (2006b). Disciplinary differences: Language variation in academic discourses. In K. Hyland & M. Bondi (Eds.) *Academic discourse across disciplines* (pp. 17-45). Peter Lang.

Hyland, K. (2016). General and specific EAP. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of EAP* (pp. 17-29). Routledge.

Hyland, K., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2002). EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(02)00002-4

Jewitt, C., Bezemer, J., & O'Halloran, K. (2016). *Introducing multimodality*. Routledge.

Kashiha, H., & Heng, C. S. (2014). Discourse functions of formulaic sequences in academic speech across two disciplines. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 14*(2). https://doi.org/10.17576/GEMA-2014-1402-02

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2011). *New literacies everyday practices and social learning*. Open University Press.

Lea, M. R. (2004). Academic literacies: A pedagogy for course design. *Studies in Higher Education*, *29*(6), 739-756. https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507042000287230

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, *23*(2), 157-172. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380364

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, *51*(1), 36-76. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350

Marius, R. (1990). On academic discourse. *Profession*, 28-31. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/25595450

Parodi, G. (2015). Variation across university genres in seven disciplines: A corpus-based study on academic written Spanish. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *20*(4), 469-499. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.20.4.03par

McWilliams, R., & Allan, Q. (2014). Embedding academic literacy skills: Towards a best practice model. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.11.3.8

Neuendorf, K. A. (2017). *The content analysis guidebook* (2nd ed.). Sage.

O'Halloran, K. L., Tan, S., & Smith, B. A. (2016). Multimodal approaches to English for academic purposes. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of EAP* (pp. 256-269). Routledge.

Pearson. (2019). *The Global Scale of English Learning Objectives for Academic English*. Available at: https://www.pearson.com/english/about/gse/learning-objectives.html

Pecorari, D., & Malmström, H. (2018). At the crossroads of TESOL and English medium instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *52*(3), 497-515. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587913

Perry, K. H. (2012). What Is Literacy?- A critical overview of sociocultural perspectives. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, *8*(1), 50-71.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010*). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Longman (Pearson Education).

Rose, H., Curle, S., Aizawa, I., & Thompson, G. (2019). What drives success in English medium taught courses? The interplay between language proficiency, academic skills, and motivation. *Studies in Higher Education*, *45*(11), 2149-2161. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1590690

Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines with a focus on introductions. *Journal of English for academic purposes*, *7*(1), 55-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.02.005

Simpson-Vlach, R. (2006). Academic speech across disciplines: lexical and phraseological distinctions. In K. Hyland & M. Bondi (Eds.) *Academic discourse across disciplines* (pp. 295-316). Peter Lang.

Terraschke, A., & Wahid, R. (2011). The impact of EAP study on the academic experiences of international postgraduate students in Australia. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *10*(3), 173-182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.05.003

Turner, J. (2012). Academic literacies: Providing a space for the socio-political dynamics of EAP. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *11*(1), 17–-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2011.11.007

UNESCO. (1979). *Records of the General Conference Twentieth Session: Resolutions*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000114032

Williams, J. (2017). *Prism Listening and Speaking 4*. Cambridge University Press.

Yang, W. (2014). Stance and engagement: A corpus-based analysis of academic spoken discourse across science domains. *LSP Journal-Language for special purposes, professional communication, knowledge management and cognition*, *5*(1), 62-78. Available at: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/230388614.pdf

Appendix

GSE Academic English Descriptors Requiring the Use of Multiple Modes

Level	Modes	Descriptor
Listening		
a2+	s+w	Can follow the main points in a simple audio recording, if provided with written supporting material. (P)
b1+	s+w	Can take effective notes while listening to a simple, straightforward presentation or lecture on a familiar topic. (P)
b1	s+p	Can recognise emphasis through intonation and stress, if guided by questions. (P)
b2+	s+w	Can follow the main points in a linguistically complex presentation or lecture, if provided with written supporting material. (P)
b2+	s+p	Can recognise the use of emphasis to highlight significant points supporting an argument in a linguistically complex presentation or lecture. (P)
b2	s+p	Can recognise emphasis through intonation and stress. (P)
b2	s+v	Can critically evaluate the effectiveness of slides or other visual materials that accompany a simple presentation. (P)
b2	s+v	Can interpret the purpose of content of visuals (e.g., diagrams, charts) used to support an academic lecture or presentation. (P)
c1	s+v	Can critically evaluate the effectiveness of slides or other visual materials that accompany a linguistically complex presentation or lecture. (P)
c1	s+w	Can compare the content of a linguistically complex presentation or lecture with written materials on the same subject. (P)
c1	s+w	Can take effective notes while listening to a linguistically complex presentation or lecture on an unfamiliar topic. (P)
Reading		

b1+	w+v	Can identify the key points presented in graphs and charts in a simple academic text, if guided by questions. (P)
b1+	w+v	Can understand numerical values in graphs and charts in a simple academic text. (P)
b1	w+v	Can predict the content of a simple academic text, using headings, images, and captions. (P)
b2+	s+w	Can recognise poetic devices such as rhythm, alliteration, or repetition. (P)
b2+	w+v	Can understand details of the use of numerical data in charts and graphs in a linguistically complex academic text. (P)
b2	w+v	Can understand the use of numerical data in graphs and charts in a linguistically complex academic text, if guided by questions. (P)
Speaking		
b1+	s+v	Can discuss illustrations in an academic text, using simple language. (P)
b1+	s+v	Can describe conclusions they have drawn from graphs and charts, using simple language. (P)
b1+	s+v	Can discuss charts and graphs in an academic text, using simple language. (P)
b1	s+v	Can explain key information in graphs and charts, using simple language. (P)
b1	s+v	Can answer basic questions about information presented in graphs and charts. (P)
b2+	s+w	Can effectively use research data in support of an argument. (P)
b2+	s+v	Can discuss the information presented in a complex diagram or visual information. (P)
b2+	s+w	Can refer to reference sources from written academic texts to support a position in a discussion. (P)
b2+	s+w+v	Can discuss diagrams in a text, using linguistically complex language. (P)
b2+	s+v	Can describe conclusions they have drawn from graphs and charts, using linguistically complex language. (P)
b2	s+w	Can paraphrase information taken from several simple academic texts. (P)
b2	s+v	Can explain information in detail in graphs and charts. (P)
c1	s+v	Can discuss illustrations in an academic text, using linguistically complex language. (P)
c1	s+v	Can present a technically complex process in their field of specialisation referring to visual support. (P)
c1	s+v	Can discuss charts and graphs in an academic text, using linguistically complex language. (P)
Writing		
b1+	w+v	Can use pictures and charts to convey basic information in a simple academic text on a familiar topic. (P
b1+	s+w	Can write a transcript of a simple interview. (P)
b1+	s+w	Can summarise information from a simple presentation or lecture aimed at a general audience. (P)
b1+	w+sy	Can write bullet points to summarise key points in a structured text. (P)

b1+	w+v	Can use simple graphs and charts to convey information in academic written work. (P)
b1	s+w	Can take notes on a simple presentation or lecture aimed at a general audience. (P)
b2+	s+w	Can take notes on a panel discussion in their field of specialisation. (P)
b2+	w+v	Can create an academic research poster to present research in their field of study. (P)
b2+	w+sy	Can write bullet points to summarise key points in a linguistically complex academic text. (P)
b2+	s+w	Can take notes on a linguistically complex presentation or lecture in their field of specialisation. (P)
b2	w+v	Can create a simple research poster to present research in their field of study. (P)
b2	w+sy	Can use statistical data, fractions, and percentages in an academic text. (P)
b2	w+sy	Can employ simple time-saving strategies when taking notes (leaving out words, abbreviations etc.). (P)
b2	w+sy	Can write bullet points to summarise key points in an academic text. (P)
b2	w+v	Can make detailed comments about numerical information in graphs and charts. (P)
b2	w+v	Can use a range of chart types (line, bar, etc.) to convey information in an academic text. (P)
c1	w+sy	Can use complex numerical values in an academic text and explain their significance to the reader. (P)
c1	w+sy	Can use citations effectively and appropriately in an academic paper. (P)
c1	s+w	Can summarise information from a linguistically complex presentation or lecture. (P)
c1	s+w	Can write a transcript of a linguistically complex interview. (P)