There is much that second-language teachers and applied linguists who want to know more about the benefits of captioned films and TV programmes can learn from this book. The book can also offer valuable insights to independent learners who wish to study or practice foreign languages by means of captioned multimedia tools. The author of this review needs to learn German. This book on captioned audiovisuals will certainly become her guide.

**English for Academic Purposes in Neoliberal Universities: A Critical Grounded Theory**


CHRISTIAN W. CHUN

University of Massachusetts Boston
Boston, Massachusetts, United States

doi: 10.1002/tesq.410

This volume is an important and ambitious attempt to address the ways in which English for academic purposes (EAP) programs at the tertiary level have been subject to the ongoing neoliberalization of universities in many countries in the past 40 years or so, and in the process becoming an integral part of the neoliberal project. Clearly situating himself within this globalizing nexus of market-driven dynamics—now a prominent dominating force in public universities in countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and Japan—Hadley presents an inside look into how EAP programs and their employees have been reshaped in ways that are not particularly conducive to the higher, nobler aims of academic language teaching and learning.

Utilizing a methodology he terms *critical grounded theory*, Hadley presents numerous participant interviews, drawing upon a database including 98 informants in Japan, the United States, and the United Kingdom, email correspondence, and coded observation notes, with the aim of featuring and analyzing the various professional survival strategies used by what Hadley terms **BLEAPs**—blended English for academic purposes professionals. These BLEAPs are a hybrid lot, mainly comprised of former senior EAP instructors (whom Hadley calls **TEAPs**—teachers of EAP) who are not quite full members of university administrative management. Along with TEAPs, BLEAPs occupy
what Hadley calls the *third space* of many universities today—neither the traditional administrative departments nor the academic ones, but instead often privatized spaces on public university campuses designed to both promote the university on a global scale, and in doing so increase international student enrollment to make up for the ever-increasing public funding cutbacks. Hadley provides a good historical background in the U.S. context in which tensions have always existed between competing views of higher education as either a place for scholarly exploration and intellectual growth, or as a site of professional training (e.g., law, medicine, business).

These discursive tensions and accompanying policies have also been enacted in universities in countries such as Canada, the United Kingdom, and Japan. Against this backdrop, Hadley raises a central issue: What and who is EAP for in tertiary educational sites? Is it for the students who have been institutionally constructed as consumer subjects contributing to the much-needed revenue streams for public universities, and yet often are not given the institutional resources to succeed in their classes and a new cultural life at the university? Are EAP programs merely a major source of international funds to said institutions, barely hidden behind the façade of cosmopolitan multicultural diversity? Employing the *in vivo* term *milking the cash cow* in referring to affluent international students in the provocatively named chapter “Hunting and Gathering,” Hadley lays bare the practices of the neoliberal university that seek additional fees for auxiliary services which have been outsourced for quite some time now. As such, many public (as well as private) universities increasingly depend on EAP programs to recruit ever greater numbers of these students.

Not surprisingly then, given these market-imposed structural changes, Hadley reports on tensions within EAP programs that have emerged between the BLEAPs and TEAPs, given that these programs are at the mercy of “administrative patronage” (p. 145). Given the greater class sizes due to bottom-line concerns, TEAPs are overworked, underpaid, and constantly evaluated by BLEAPs who are institutionally forced to manage in particular ways inasmuch as their own positions within the university are precariously dependent upon ever greater student recruitment and numbers. These conflicting roles have resulted in what Hadley argues is “a loss of collegiality, disempowerment and ‘BLEAPifcation’” (p. 145), which has led to a professional identity crisis for EAP instructors in these programs.

This of course is not new, as there have long existed competing demands of teachers in EAP classrooms, as scholars such as Sarah Benesch, Brian Morgan, and myself have documented in asking these questions of the EAP field: Are EAP instructors merely pedagogic
technicians of academic registers, genres, and discourse? Have they been subjectified as “factory workers,” as Hadley describes the reshaping of their roles in universities today? Are there still spaces, in the classroom or beyond, where EAP instructors can enact critical practices in confronting both curriculum and institutional discourses and policies with their students in recasting their roles other than helping to serve the bottom line of universities? Hadley in his concluding chapter offers several ideas and avenues for this to happen, and, as he acknowledges, more research needs to be done to address these issues.

Interviews with students enrolled in the EAP programs Hadley studied would have added insight into how they are actually impacted on an everyday lived experiential level. In addition, Hadley does not seem to clearly differentiate critical grounded theory approaches to interviews and observations from similar ethnographic and/or action research methodological approaches. Nevertheless, this book is an important contribution to the debate needed on the future of not only EAP programs but also on the mission of our public universities in this era of ongoing neoliberal privatization of public funds.