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Introduction

As this volume illustrates, today there is a wealth of research on English for academic purposes (EAP), much of which has focused on identifying the communication demands and challenges faced by those engaged in research writing and presentation. Importantly, this research can now serve as the foundation of our teaching and materials development for courses targeting post-graduates or research students. We are also in a very good position to incorporate into our teaching the notion of data-driven learning (DDL), exposing students to large amounts of authentic corpus data so that they can discern interesting and useful aspects of language on their own (Johns 1991, Johns 2002). Indeed, despite controversies and unresolved questions in our field (Hyland 2012), we have come quite far in our ability to offer EAP coursework that is data informed, relevant and well positioned to help students navigate their way through their degree programs and become full participants in their chosen own fields.

To appreciate how EAP support has evolved over the years, let us begin by considering a class session in an EAP writing course designed for post-graduate students at a prestigious university in the eastern United States in 1985. As was typical of the time, all of the students were international students from such diverse fields as electrical engineering, physics, law, hospitality management and labor relations, among other disciplines. The students were learning about comparison–contrast organization and were reading an essay entitled “Grant and Lee: A Study Contrast” written by Bruce Catton (1956). A widely read essay in U.S. undergraduate composition classes, it analyzes two U.S. civil war generals, the North’s Grant and the South’s Lee, who were meeting to effectively bring an end to the war. The essay was chosen so that students could analyze and understand the rhetorical pattern for a future writing assignment and not to help students with academic reading. After some discussion of the content, verb tense and organization, some attention was given over to vocabulary such as hazy, poignant, sanctified, sinewy, obeisance, diametrically and reconciliation. Finally, the students were given a list of expressions for indicating similarity and difference, which was based on the intuitions of a small team of instructors. The students spent time reformulating some sentences using different expressions from the list so that they could vary their sentence structure for comparing and contrasting.

At the end of class the students were asked to write a 500-word comparison–contrast essay that would be graded in terms of how well the highlighted organizational pattern was
followed, and how effectively comparison and contrast language was used to support the pattern. Students were allowed to choose any topic they wanted provided that the resulting essay was organized in terms of comparison and contrast. To complete the assignment, one physics student in the second year of his PhD program wrote about sticky rice and long grain rice, while a second year PhD student in electrical engineering described her two friends, each essay receiving the highest possible score.

It remains an open question whether the two post-graduate students or any of the students in the course gained any insight into the complexities of academic writing. But regardless of whether the class was providing the right type of support, it may come as a surprise that in the mid-1980s it was truly innovative in important ways. For one, it was credit bearing and provided exclusive support for matriculated post-graduate students. For another, the course was offered at a time when there was little support for these students and when many believed that any attention to writing at this level was “a form of remediation” that did not belong in post-graduate education (Golding and Mascaro 1985: 176). While many U.S. universities offered intensive English language programs for students interested in pursuing a university degree, far fewer offered courses targeting post-graduate students’ communicative needs. Also relevant here is that students were writing essays consisting of several paragraphs, revealing how English for specific purposes (ESP) writing instruction was moving beyond register analysis and sentence grammar as the main focus of interest to attend to rhetoric (Dudley-Evans and St John 1998).

By today’s standards, of course, there is much to critique about the class. One could criticize the choice of the prose model approach, in which students read, analyzed and then imitated texts, writing with few or no sources. One could also question the choice of a model essay written by an established historian on a topic requiring knowledge of the U.S. civil war, which most international students lacked; the emphasis on product rather than process; the list of comparison–contrast expressions based on guesswork; and the focus on form rather than content which perhaps misled students into thinking of “form as a mold into which content is somehow poured” (Eschholz 1980: 35) and that “the way to good writing was to mold oneself into the contours of prior greatness” (Bazerman 1980: 656). I offer the scenario not to harshly criticize, but rather to demonstrate that we were unsure of how to meet the students’ needs.

It is reasonable to wonder why the course developers did not seem to realize that the students, just as post-graduates today, were expected to write papers to demonstrate content understanding and to write up research for theses, dissertations and later articles for publication. The simple answer is that at the time, unlike instructors in pre-matriculation EAP programs, instructors of EAP courses for enrolled post-graduates had few resources to draw from. Research was scarce and what little was available was not so easy to find as it is today. Since research was not readily available to guide course development, materials often consisted of texts, exercises and ideas designed for other purposes, such as those for undergraduate composition courses for domestic students (which, in 1976, Zamel noted were grounded in research that had relevance for EAP writing instruction), and some ESP textbooks focused on science and technology, which were a poor reflection of actual language use (Holmes 1988). In some cases, instructors developed their own in-house materials, mostly as isolated individuals and with little input from available research. Unlike the present EAP teaching context, as Mackay pointed out, there was “no ready-researched body of information upon which to draw” (1981: 108). EAP support was often a matter of what could be offered as opposed to what should be. Indeed EAP, along with its parent field ESP, was a fledgling discipline (Hyland and Hamp-Lyons 2002). Practitioners of the time certainly
would have welcomed the needs analyses, linguistic analyses and materials that are so widely available today.

The mismatch between the post-graduate students’ EAP needs and the course content may be hard to grasp if we recall that in the 1980s, publications were emerging that were relevant for post-graduate EAP writing instruction. For instance, Kroll (1979) identified data commentary and lab reports as important writing activities, while Ostler (1980) isolated the latter along with book reviews, research papers and research proposals. Other common writing tasks identified were article summaries (Behrens 1978, Ostler 1980, Bridgeman and Carlson 1984). West and Byrd (1982) investigated the writing needs of engineering graduate students and found that research and technical reports were commonly required. One paper that focused on vocabulary teaching even mentioned that for a post-graduate student, it was important to “read about research in his [sic] own area and related areas; to listen to professors speak about their work or the work of colleagues; and often to write papers incorporating the research of others” (Martin 1976: 91).

Whether focused on undergraduates or post-graduates, the findings of this important, early work clearly had relevance for students engaged in research writing. Yet, at the same time, there was still ample support for maintaining an emphasis on general essay writing because “in most post-graduate courses in Britain and North America, the most frequent learning assignment and the most usual method of assessment is the written essay” (McDonough 1985: 244). This lack of alignment between coursework and post-graduate student language needs persisted well into the 1990s, as documented by Leki and Carson (1997), who in fact described the EAP writing and writing in the actual academic context as “completely different worlds” (39).

Although the discussion thus far has been on writing, much of what I have said so far can be extended to EAP speaking support for post-graduates, as well. For example, at the same prestigious university introduced earlier, the speaking class for international post-graduates in 1985 consisted of students from a range of disciplines. It was discussion-based, with either a student or the instructor leading, and designed to provide opportunities for students to practice speaking and improve their proficiency. Lessons on non-discussion days generally focused on one of the following: pronunciation practice, non-verbal communication and backchanneling, idioms and slang, politeness (drawing from Brown and Levinson [1978]) as well as discussion gambits (conversational tools for participating in discussion such as “I think that …” or “In my opinion …”) (Keller 1979) and “conventional language forms” or language patterns (Yorio 1980). The course incorporated some discourse analysis and pragmatics research into some of the lessons, with the work of Grice (1975, 1981) and Brown and Yule (1983) being particularly valuable. Some time was even devoted to talking on the telephone, grammar reviews and listening comprehension. Although research was being done on speaking, none of this specifically shed light on the needs of post-graduates in such important areas as talking about research, giving presentations and interacting with experts and non-experts alike, which we know are important today.

There was no textbook that could cover all of these topics and so materials had to be created or assembled from various sources, as was the case for the writing course. For instance, material from English as a second language (ESL) speaking books led to discussions focused on a dilemma such as which candidate should receive a donated heart or who should be allowed to enter a nuclear fallout shelter. Materials often focused on gambits that could be used in these discussions. The discussions, of course, did provide opportunities for students to speak and learn something about spoken English and may have even helped them gain confidence, but it is unclear whether these opportunities benefited them in their interactions.
with professors, giving research presentations or handling the demands of a dissertation or thesis defense.

The course did not take into account the limited, but useful, EAP research mentioning that post-graduate students needed to present research findings orally (Martin 1976) and engage in seminar discussion (Johns 1981, Beatty and Chan 1984). There was also, unfortunately, no speaking needs analysis comparable to those done for writing (Kroll 1979, Oster 1980, Bridgeman and Carlson 1984; one of the early ones was Ferris and Tagg’s work which did not appear until 1996). In the few investigations that touched on post-graduate speaking, it was found that professors often ranked speaking as less important than reading and listening (Johns 1981). The one exception was concern for the speaking proficiency of teaching assistants (TAs) where there was growing interest in international TAs (Bailey 1983), an area for which support and resources were more likely to be available than for other EAP needs.

Interestingly, some English for science and technology (EST) research on speaking was available that could have informed EAP teaching and that still has relevance for today, specifically publications on conference posters (van Naerssen 1984, Dubois 1985) and talks supported by slides (Dubois 1981). This work was not brought into the classroom perhaps because it was not clear how research focused on science and technology professionals was connected to post-graduate speaking needs. Indeed, in the mid-1980s, students had somewhat less pressure to present at conferences than do their counterparts today, who are stepping into the research world at earlier stages in their PhD programs (Swales and Feak 2012). Thus, there was no strong motivation to extend the EST research to the EAP context.

The disconnect among student needs, research and teaching was not simply a matter of the newness of EAP teaching for matriculated post-graduate students, the limited research or the lack of materials. On the contrary, a fundamental issue was how the purpose of these classes was envisioned. Based on an in-house language re-assessment, the students had been identified as having a low level of proficiency, not “ready” to handle the linguistic demands of their programs and so required to take the classes. The primary task at hand, therefore, was exclusively focused on creating opportunities for students to develop general proficiency, as opposed to acquire “the communicative skills to participate in particular academic and cultural contexts” (Hyland and Hamp-Lyons 2002: 2). The irony is that whether or not the students were proficient enough to handle their coursework, they were nonetheless engaged with the discourses of their disciplines and seeking to understand their “textual worlds, processes of induction into their chosen disciplines, as well as the hybrid discourses and multi-modal genres they were expected to master” (Feak 2009: 42).

The exclusive focus on EAP coursework as a means to address proficiency failed to help students become “genre ready” (Swales and Feak 2011); to provide opportunities for students to develop their research English; to raise their consciousness about how written and spoken genres are constructed and why; to handle the myriad of communicative tasks connected with an advanced degree ranging from writing email to corresponding with reviewers and editors to giving poster presentations to writing an article for publication.

**Making EAP support attractive for research students today**

Our approach to EAP support for research should consider proficiency, but equally important is the need to take the student’s current communication demands into account. Whether or not post-graduate students are proficient enough to write literature reviews or give a presentation on their research, they are engaged in these activities. We should broaden our concern beyond proficiency for several reasons. First, evidence to support the notion
that proficiency is a good predictor of academic risk is not particularly compelling. Indeed, whether a connection exists between academic success and proficiency has been the focus of ongoing debate (see, for instance, Dooey 2010, Cho and Bridgeman 2012, Phakiti et al. 2013). Overall, it appears that the link between language proficiency and academic success is tenuous (but see Cho and Bridgeman 2012). This should not be completely unexpected if we consider that not all native speakers of English successfully complete their post-graduate degrees and when they do, at least in the U.S., they often require more time than their international peers (King 2008, Ampaw and Jaeger 2012).

A second reason to not privilege proficiency over actual need is that those deemed to have a high or a high enough level of English proficiency may have limited, or perhaps no, access to EAP support, if such courses target lower-level students. Proficient students are often considered “too advanced” to need EAP support and believed to have the linguistic capital needed for success in their chosen degree programs. Thus, when we read course descriptions of many EAP programs, it is disappointing that many offer such courses as Academic Speaking 1 or Academic Writing for Graduate Students 1 described in this manner:

**Academic Speaking 1**
This 3-credit speaking course is designed for international students who scored 45 or 50 on the SPEAK test, or 23–27 on the TOEFL-IBT

**Academic Writing for Graduate Students 1**
This course, designed for non-native speakers of English at a low-advanced level of proficiency in written English, focuses on writing for the academic context.

While we may reasonably be concerned about proficiency, such descriptions do little to promise students that their immediate EAP needs will be met. They do little to invite more proficient students to seek support or to help students, advisors and faculty across the university see that in a writing class, for example, regardless of their proficiency students will have opportunities to learn about genres and moves as well as to handle complex writing and speaking tasks such as creating a research space; imposing order on previous studies that supports their research; guiding their reader through their texts or talks; having a stance toward what they say or write; and negotiating knowledge claims.

The reality today is that all post-graduates, regardless of proficiency or L1, can benefit from EAP support offered in a variety of modes including workshops, semester-long courses and one-on-one consultations (either face-to-face or computer-mediated such as Skype). Drawing from existing EAP research, we can provide support for post-graduates that recognizes that communicative demands become increasingly more challenging as students progress through the stages of their doctoral programs (Casanave 2014) and offer support at these different stages and at the right time.

How to exactly go about offering ongoing support is a difficult question to answer since each post-graduate program places some unique communicative demands on students. And even when demands seem similar, they may in fact be quite different. In my own institution, for example, a thesis (dissertation) proposal in one department may consist of a roughly 25-page literature review that concludes with research questions and an approach to investigating them. In another department the proposal may be the first three chapters of a traditional thesis (dissertation), often written after two years of coursework. To understand the unique contexts of our home institutions, we may conduct a needs analysis. Needs analyses to inform teaching are important to our work (see, for instance, Elisha-Primo et al. 2010,
Prior 2009). We may learn, for instance, that in a speaking class, we should work on presentations supported by slides and integrating talk and text. We may learn that students in a writing class might benefit from coursework focusing on various aspects of a job search from CV to the job talk. Yet, needs analysis can also uncover needs that cannot be addressed due to a lack of instructional time or resources. Thus, consideration might need to be given over to what instructors are able to do (Swales 1978). An example here would be course assignments in seminars that require students to write a weekly blog or contribute to the writing of a wiki, areas of computer-mediated communication that are just beginning to be explored in the EAP literature (Kutseva 2011, Luzón 2011). At the same time, needs analyses may not provide a broad enough picture (Molle and Prior 2008), particularly with regard to the relationships among reading, speaking, listening and writing along with the visual/non-verbal aspects of knowledge creation.

Apart from needs analysis, we need to consult EAP and ESP research, which today can inform our decision making when designing EAP courses. We have a growing understanding of post-graduate writing (see, for instance, descriptions in Cooper and Bikowski 2007, Huang 2010, Ådel and Römer 2012, Swales and Feak 2012, Cheng 2014); as well as a growing understanding of speaking in research contexts (e.g., Rowley-Jolivet and Carter-Thomas 2005a, Rowley-Jolivet and Carter-Thomas 2005b, Mauranen 2009, Morton 2009, Feak 2013); listening (Lynch 2011) and reading (Hirvela 2013). Importantly, to support post-graduate students, EAP and ESP research needs to be translated into a form that makes it accessible to our students. The knowledge is there for the taking, but to fully benefit from EAP and ESP research the findings must be put into action: that is, we need to move our research knowledge off the proverbial shelves and into the classroom. With this perspective in mind, the work of researchers, instructors, course designers and materials developers should become more fluid.

Some current EAP perspectives and needs of post-graduate students

Beyond needs analyses and translating research findings into useful materials for our EAP classrooms, in order to remain responsive, current and flexible (i.e. to teach well), it is important for instructors to continuously learn from students to understand their pressing writing and speaking concerns along with the strategies they rely on to address those concerns. As a result of ongoing surveys of and interviews with my post-graduate students in a dissertation writing course, I can say with confidence that some needs have remained constant, while new challenges are emerging.

Students highlight the continuing need for genre and sub-genre-focused support that targets, for instance, literature reviews, book reviews, empirical papers for publication and proposals of various kinds (Cooper and Bikowski 2007) as well as dissertations or theses (Thompson 2013). They report a desire to develop speaking skills, particularly for research presentations for conferences, the job search, and for defense of a thesis, dissertation or a proposal. To support their learning, post-graduates continue to see value in investigating authentic language in online corpora such as the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE), the Michigan Corpus of Upper-level Student Papers (MICUSP), the British National Corpus (BNC), the Corpus of Contemporary American (COCA), The British Academic Spoken English (BASE), The British Academic Written English corpus (BAWE), Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) and English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (ELFA) to name a few. They also appreciate learning to use computer tools (e.g. Lextutor, Wordsmith Tools and Antconc) to investigate their questions
about writing and speaking. Indeed, corpus analysis has value as a central approach to our teaching and to post-graduate student learning (Lee and Swales 2006, Flowerdew 2009, Charles 2014, Simpson-Vlach 2013).

Students report new communicative challenges that are emerging as the post-graduate student population changes. One source of major change is the establishment of new university initiatives and the internationalization of universities. Post-graduate students no longer neatly fall into the two traditional categories: international students enrolled in degree programs in Anglophone countries, and students in non-Anglophone countries who use course materials available only in English (textbooks, in particular) (Björkman 2011). More recently, EAP teaching at the post-graduate level has expanded to include post-graduates in the context of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) (Arnó-Macià and Mancho-Barés 2015) in which English is the medium of university instruction in non-Anglophone countries (Björkman 2011) and a lingua franca. To these three groups we need to also add students enrolled in English-medium universities that are satellites or branches of universities (Anglophone or otherwise) whose home bases are in other countries such as the University of Michigan in China, the London Business School in the United Arab Emirates, Monash University in Malaysia and the Technical University of Berlin in Egypt. Finally, if we can agree that language proficiency should not be the gatekeeper to support, we cannot ignore L1 speakers of English pursuing post-graduate qualifications in Anglophone countries, who are increasingly seeking the type of EAP support offered to L2 speakers of English.

Many post-graduate students report that they do not have backgrounds in the disciplines they are entering or that they are non-traditional, such as returning to school after a hiatus or making career changes. These students can be expected to face a number of challenges that may differ from those of traditional students who begin a post-graduate degree program shortly after completing an undergraduate degree (Green et al. 2013). For traditional students, apart from establishing their new identities as students, they must also create an identity that extends beyond a course participant or knowledge consumer to researcher/knowledge producer. This process involves a constellation of linguistic and non-linguistic factors, such as motivation and self efficacy (Sawir et al. 2012, Phakiti et al. 2013).

Post-graduates increasingly report challenges understanding not one, but multiple disciplinary audiences. As divisions among traditional disciplines are being eroded, post-graduates are increasingly engaged in interdisciplinary work. Students in mathematics may be working with biologists to mathematically model complex protein processes, while others in information science may be conducting studies with medical doctors to optimize health information sharing. As these examples suggest, interdisciplinary work requires research students to enter into a multitude of discourse communities (O’Regan and Johnston 2000) and navigate several “academic tribes and territories”, each with its own distinct set of practices (Becher and Trowler 2001), “values, processes, and world views” (Reich and Reich 2006: 52). A significant challenge here is that even students’ own advisors may lack the discoursal expertise they expect their students to acquire so that they understand the thinking, reading and writing practices embodied in each discipline (Swales 1990, Swales and Feak 2000). In light of this, EAP courses for post-graduate students need to provide opportunities for students to become sensitive to “the complex ways in which discourse is situated ” (Hyland 2002: 393) and to disciplinary variation.

Post-graduates report new areas of speaking and writing that could potentially be addressed in our EAP courses. Examples here include project summaries, blogs, tweets (tweet your dissertation), genres of the job search (“elevator pitches”, teaching statements,
research statements and cover letters), biostatements, web pages, email, presentations for school groups, research presentations in departments outside their disciplines, and talking to reporters. As can be seen, many of these involve communicating research in new ways and to new audiences, an emergent need worthy of attention in our post-graduate EAP courses.

 Communicating with non-experts

Already in 1984, Huckin and Olsen highlighted the need for university students to develop the ability to communicate with non-specialists, especially since they may need to write for and speak to various stakeholders such as company managers, supervisors and government officials. While Huckin and Olsen focused on instruction that can help students in technical fields acquire communication skills for career purposes, in particular speaking and writing, the observation that students need to communicate with non-specialists has never been more true than it is today. Apart from interdisciplinary work that requires post-graduates to communicate with colleagues outside their disciplines, colleagues within the same broad disciplinary area may be so specialized that they have difficulty communicating with each other about their research. Take, for example, the School of Natural Resources in my university. Work in this school ranges from landscape architecture, green and smart building design, to the use of satellite remote sensing to understand land use and cover change. Students report spending one month of every academic year in workshops and other activities aimed at helping faculty and students learn and relearn how to communicate with each other.

Earlier I suggested that for the full benefit of research to be reaped, we need to move it into the real world. Similarly, post-graduate students today are reporting growing pressure to share their work with non-experts. For instance, with the push to create a more educated public, governmental funding agencies are expecting funded research to be made accessible to the public. To this end, post-graduates may need to write with a non-expert audience in mind when they prepare project summaries for federal grants. Other contexts where non-experts are the target audience include reports for policymakers, overviews of sponsored research from non-government sources, or even travel grants from a student’s home university. Further, there are growing expectations that lay abstracts will accompany institutional research review board packets, applications for post-doc positions and published research papers. In the case of published research, a commitment to making research accessible means that post-graduates may need to compose lay abstracts. Consider, for instance, the following excerpts from the expert abstract (text A) and the lay abstract (text B) in a pharmaceutical journal.

Determining the delamination propensity of pharmaceutical glass vials using a direct stress method

PDA Journal of Pharmaceutical Science and Technology January/February 2013 vol. 67 no. 1

A. An accelerated lamellae formation (ALF) methodology has been developed to determine the delamination propensity and susceptibility of pharmaceutical glass vials. The ALF process consists of a vial wash and depyrogenation mimic procedure followed by stressing glass vials with 20 mM glycine pH 10.0 solution at 50°C for 24h and analyzing the resulting solutions by visual inspection for glass lamellae. ALF results demonstrate that while vial delamination propensity generally correlates
with glass hydrolytic resistance, ALF is a more direct test of glass delamination propensity and is not affected by post-production vial washing that can affect results obtained using hydrolytic resistance tests. ALF can potentially be used by pharmaceutical companies to evaluate and screen incoming vial lots to minimize the risk of delamination during the shelf life of parenteral therapeutics, and by glass vial manufacturers to monitor and improve their vial manufacturing processes.

B. Glass flakes can sometimes appear in liquid pharmaceutical drugs contained in glass vials. These glass flakes are a result of several factors related to the glass vial production process, glass vial sterilization procedures, and the formulation of the liquid pharmaceutical drug. Vial testing is routinely done in order to select glass vials that are less likely to form glass flakes. The factors leading to the formation of glass flakes were studied and applied to a method designed to directly screen vials for their propensity to form glass flakes. The washing of vials followed immediately by sterilization at high temperatures was determined to be a critical factor in the formation of glass flakes. As a result, a laboratory mimic of this procedure was incorporated into the newly developed method for screening vials. This mimic procedure as well as robust accelerated incubation conditions and a sensitive visual inspection procedure are key aspects of this vial screening method.

It is not possible to discuss the two excerpts in detail here, but clearly a key challenge in writing such abstracts is for authors to realize that disciplinary and genre knowledge can hinder attempts to communicate content (Schriver 2012), and it may be unclear to post-graduate students that the more disciplinary knowledge they have, the more they need to consider audience needs (Schriver 2012), particularly what knowledge they share with others (common ground) and what they do not share. Thus, post-graduates who might have spent years acquiring sophisticated subject-matter and genre knowledge to write expert-to-expert communications now need to learn to reach other audiences beyond their network of peers.

To help students learn to communicate with non-experts, we can offer EAP instruction in forms other than traditional courses. For instance, EAP programs can sponsor opportunities in which they can “translate” their research so that a non-expert can understand and appreciate. Recent innovations here include the Three Minute Thesis (3MT®) (University of Queensland 2014) in which students have exactly three minutes to explain their research in language and a single slide that are accessible to an intelligent but non-expert audience. Other opportunities include offering slams or nerd nights, where researchers take the stage to share their research, and the highly creative “Dance Your PhD” competitions (Bohannon 2008). For writing, it may be possible to sponsor a writing competition such as the Lay Summary Writing Competition held at the University of Manchester, UK (University of Manchester 2014).

Final thoughts

Questions and criticisms have been raised regarding the value of EAP. For instance, EAP support has been criticized both for not sufficiently addressing the specific disciplinary needs of students (Hansen 2000) and for failing to motivate students to challenge the educational practices of their disciplines (Benesch 2009). These criticisms certainly can and must be addressed. What also needs to be addressed is the notion of EAP as a quick fix for students who are beginning academic programs and who seem to lack the English language proficiency...
needed for success. Given today’s post-graduates and the communication challenges they face, ongoing EAP support for all post-graduate students is more important today than ever before. The transition from the role of a post-graduate student in the structured environment of disciplinary coursework into that of an independent scholar and researcher requires that students acquire new communication skills and competencies throughout their degree programs, for which supervisors cannot always provide support. Although there is still a place for EAP classes targeting less proficient students in the early stages of their programs, it is important for EAP programs to offer a range of courses that attract and reach out to students of all levels of English proficiency at various stages of their degree programs. We can start by offering courses that can give students insights into the writing and speaking demands of coursework. These may, for instance, focus on email, summarizing, evaluative writing (e.g. reviews of books and/or published papers) and syntheses of studies, creating slides or other visuals, culminating in the writing of a short literature and oral presentation. As post-graduate students move further into their programs, they would benefit from courses on research-paper writing, proposal writing and writing for qualifying exams. Students would also find value from courses focused on speaking in research contexts such as conferences or workshops to prepare for the Three Minute Thesis. Other courses could guide students through the dissertation or with writing for publication (including the writing of a manuscript, cover letters and corresponding with reviewers and editors). Students may also benefit from courses that cover the genres of the job search, which would focus on cover letters, personal statements, teaching philosophies and research statements. We have the research to support the development of high quality courses to support students from their first semester to their last. Given the growing communicative demands on post-graduate students, putting our research into practice in creative ways is central to providing support to all post-graduates.
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