

COMMUNICATION SKILLS IN ACADEMIC MONOLOGUE DISCOURSE.
EMPIRICAL AND APPLIED PERSPECTIVES

Carmen Pérez-Llantada

Universidad de Zaragoza

[llantada en posta unizar es](mailto:llantada@posta.unizar.es)

Abstract

This paper discusses those metadiscourse techniques that help develop learners' communication skills in university courses of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Firstly, the theoretical framework of the concept of metadiscourse (Hyland 1998, Mauranen 1998&2000, Swales 2001, Thompson 2003) is revised and then applied to those language strategies for effective communication which are covered by current bibliographical references on academic listening and speaking in these courses. In the second part of the article, an empirical analysis illustrates how metadiscourse in EAP monologic speech is targeted to enhance both the cognitive (Wilson & Sperber 1998) and interpersonal aspects of language use (Ventola & Mauranen 1991, Johns 1997, Hyland 2000). The third part of the paper details experimental research concerning suitable pedagogical procedures for teaching/learning spoken metadiscourse through a genre-based approach (Ferguson 2002). The article concludes with a reflection on the need to approach tertiary education syllabuses from the perspective of a social theory of language and communication.

1. Communication techniques and oral speech. The *status quo*.

At present teaching communication techniques in Spanish tertiary education mainly appears to focus on the consolidation of a number of academic skills which range from writing and speaking skills to research and critical analysis skills. Most University syllabuses of English for Academic Purposes

(EAP heretofore) cover a broad range of communication situations which take place in the academic life of the students or which will take in their future professional careers. These are, among others, interdisciplinary presentations in specialised classrooms, oral instructions in laboratory sessions or workshops, degree or dissertation defenses, attendance to academic lecturing in foreign universities, presentation of papers in international conferences or professional presentations and oral reports in meetings and negotiations. Contextualisation is a basic premise and language learning is understood as learning to communicate effectively. Students are involved in the comprehension and production of the foreign language at an upper-intermediate or advanced level. Interactive skills –or the practice of rules of interaction in the foreign language– also become a central component of the learning process as they entail the ability to respond appropriately in different academic and professional encounters.

In our experience as EAP teachers, communication strategies entail three main pedagogical advantages. First, learning techniques for effective communication is an essential element in the development of the learner's language and personal skills. The current trend in Spanish EAP teaching postulates a systemic analysis of discourse which regards language as a vehicle for interpersonal relations and for the performance of social transactions between individuals. Accordingly, what is expected from the learners is to become skillful communicators in the four dimensions of communicative competence proposed by Canale & Swain (1980) –grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence. Secondly, teaching communication techniques in monologic speech can serve as a convenient transition from prepared written discourse to rehearsed spoken communication, and as a preamble to spontaneous –or non-prepared– speech. Ferguson (2002) recommends a rich-instruction genre-based approach to academic and professional speech as it offers several advantages: to cope with real communicative needs, to handle authentic materials in the class, to analyse contextualized texts either in part or as a whole, to perform real-life communicative activities and to study language interdisciplinarily.

The cognitive and affective sides of learning are the third reason why monologic speech plays an important role in EAP courses. The rationale of the syllabus involves carrying out a series of communication tasks to activate learners' formal and instrumental schemas in language use (Estaire & Zanón 1994). The former comprise consolidation of systemic knowledge –that is to say, the lexicogrammatical, semantic and phonological layers of language– and schematic knowledge of discourse –or the strategic and sociolinguistic aspects of this genre. Instrumental schemas are seen as the ability to use the content for real communication, namely, participation in task-procedures such as topic–

researching, critical reading, selective listening, fluent speaking, group cooperation and even coping with difficulties during performance. As Scharle and Szabó (2000) claim, weaving together formal and instrumental knowledge to construct communicative competence in the classroom encourages learner responsibility and maximises motivation and autonomous attitudes.

2. Theoretical approach to teaching/learning metadiscourse in monologic speech

At present, EAP courses in Spanish tertiary education are taking a special interest in the pragmatic and rhetorical aspects of disciplinary discourses. Whereas guides on style and rhetoric (Barras 1978, Day 1979, Wilkinson 1991) recommend clarity and objectivity in the presentation of contents functional systemicists, sociolinguists and genre analysts (Biber & Finegan 1994, Kasper & Kellerman 1997, Martin & Veel 1998, Swales 2001, Reppen et al 2002) highlight the social component of specialised registers. In the light of these studies, academic discourse seems to be a matter of “how to do things with words” –intertextually quoting Austin’s work (1962)– or, put it simply, of knowing how to communicate successfully to other peers. Indeed, there are many social reasons why speakers should concentrate not only on contents but also on the formal architecture of discourse. In both academic settings, effective communication entails not only providing information in a clear and objective way but also producing a desired effect on the audience. Such effect may be to highlight current research, to suggest the implementation of new technologies, to assess a given method or procedure, to raise funds for research, to be accepted by the academic institution or all of the aforementioned.

But what is metadiscourse and what is the role of metadiscourse in academic and professional communication? In his article “Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse,” Ken Hyland defines written metadiscourse as those “aspects of a text which explicitly organise the discourse, engage the audience and signal the writer’s attitude” (1998: 437). He further states that

Based on a view of writing as a social and communicative engagement between writer and reader, metadiscourse focuses our attention on the ways writers project themselves into their work to signal their communicative intentions. It is a central pragmatic construct which allows us to see how writers seek to influence readers’ understandings of both the text and their attitude towards its content and the audience. (p. 437)

Following the Hallidayian school of language, Hyland distinguishes between textual metadiscourse –or those “devices which allow the recovery of the writer’s intentions by explicitly establishing preferred interpretations of propositional meanings” (op. cit.: 442)– and interpersonal metadiscourse

–which “alerts readers to the author’s perspective towards both the propositional information and the readers themselves” and as such is “essentially interactional and evaluative” (p. 443). Hyland’s taxonomy of textual and interpersonal types of written metadiscourse proves to be very useful when teaching of monologic speech in EAP courses. In fact it is worth pointing out that raising students’ awareness of metadiscourse techniques in academic speech can be approached from two convergent disciplines: cognitive theory and pragmatics. From the perspective of cognition metadiscourse will necessarily focus on the processes of production and processing of speech. In particular, through textual metadiscourse listeners can reconstruct the organising structure of the talk, identify the logical linkage of contents thus processing the flow of information more easily and can also activate those conceptual schemas involved in communication. If regarded from the premises of sociology and pragmatics, attention can be drawn to the process of interaction between speaker(s) and listener(s) or the speaker and his/her community. Accordingly, interpersonal metadiscourse allows the audience to understand speaker’s implicatures and presuppositions as well as speaker’s stance while considering the social framework of the speech act.

Using metadiscourse means that the speaker has foreseen the audience’s interactive frames and knowledge schemas (Tannen & Wallat 1999) and that s/he has made the necessary amendments and additions to the information flow. If, as members of the same discourse community, both speakers and listeners use similar interpretive mappings, effective speech will cope with the audience’s expectations in terms of contents, contextual resources and disciplinary knowledge and, as Wilson & Sperber (1998: 9) would state, will therefore “search for maximal relevance.” As a result, using metadiscourse allows listeners to understand discourse texture and intertextuality, to share pragmatic presuppositions, to infer intended meanings, and to interpret the institutional and ideological ties underlying the communicative act. In order to illustrate how techniques for effective communication work in EAP courses the following section analyses the cognitive and interpersonal aspects of metadiscourse techniques in the genre of academic presentations. The techniques selected for the analysis have been gathered from well-known commercial textbooks (Comfort 1995, Sweeney 1997, Powell 2001, Reinhart 2002, among others) as they successfully approach the teaching of communication skills and are often selected as bibliographical references in EAP Spanish university syllabuses.

As far as introductions in monologic speech are concerned, metadiscourse reifies both the cognitive and the pragmatic demands of academic communication. The rhetorical structure of introductory sections includes welcoming the audience, introducing oneself, stating the purpose and topic, and

outlining talk organisation and use of visuals. At the end of the introduction, speakers often state the time schedule of the talk and welcome listeners' interaction during or at the end of the presentation. If speakers use these metatextual or self-referencing practices to inform listeners about the internal structure or the different sections of the talk effective communication can be ensured. Ventola & Mauranen (1991: 463) employ the term "self-referentiality" for similar techniques in academic written discourse, Mauranen refers to them as "reference items" and "text reflexivity as self-awareness" (1993: Chapter 6), and Johns calls them "pre-revealing features" or "metamessages" (1997: 120-122). This simple but useful strategy signalling speech organisation involves an easier production and processing of ideas, as cognitive theorists postulate. In addition, the rhetorical force of self-referentiality makes for clarity and conciseness in the speech and supports a more effective argumentation when trying to persuade an academic audience.

The introductory section of academic presentations often works as an encapsulated problem-solution micro-text of the whole speech. To solve a given problem the speaker provides a new method for correcting an error, presents an application to cope with previous disadvantages, recommends an improved procedure or foregrounds a given research to overcome lack of funds, for example. Textual metadiscourse thus helps to establish an information background and draws the audience's interest towards further clarifications about research objectives and procedures. At the same time, the text becomes rhetorically forceful; by filling a research niche –that is, solving the problem– the presenter places greater emphasis on the speech.

Intermediate sections of presentations also tend to contain several metadiscourse techniques which explicitly provide clues to interpret discursal meanings. One of these are the so called discourse connectors and related connective expressions. As Blakemore (2002) remarks, relevance in communication entails a pragmatically-effective discourse signalling for different purposes: to show how information in the text is logically linked through comparisons and contrasts (*similarly, in addition, by contrast, etc.*), to exemplify (*let me give you an example, such as..., to illustrate this point...*), to present action in chronological sequence (*first, secondly, finally,...*), to make the audience infer a problem (*but, however*), to support arguments convincingly (*I point this out because..., due to..., this leads/brings me to... etc.*) or simply to indicate listeners the following point or section of the talk (*[S]o far we have looked at ...; now ..., [L]et's now move to ..., etc.*). Reformulative markers and expressions also perform a metadiscourse function in academic speech as they show the speaker's awareness of the interpersonal nature of communication. *That is to say, in other words* or *let me explain it in a different way* serve to clarify and emphasise important information. Similarly,

paraphrasing connectives (*in conclusion, what I'm trying to say is... or Let me just sum that up before we move on to...*) foreground relevant points or signpost the beginning of a new section of the speech.

There are some other metadiscourse techniques which are also included in EAP syllabuses mainly due to their broad use in specialised contexts of communication. One of these is to explain things by analogy. This technique entails the speaker's awareness of the way difficult conceptualisations should be explained to a non-specialised audience. Rhetorical questions –or questions which you do not expect the audience to reply to (*how can we explain this?, What can we do then?*)– are also useful to get listeners to think about what the speaker has said and about his/her response to the question. Similarly, dramatic structures (*What's really surprising is..., What I would like to talk about today is...*), dramatic contrasts (*In the 80s..., these ...*), epistemic expressions and hedging devices (*just, quite, slightly, almost, we strongly recommend, I fully believe...*) represent effective techniques to build up interest in the point the speaker wants to make. Language variation according to communicative purpose and context of situation also shows how those speakers seeking interaction from the audience tend to include interpersonal metadiscourse strategies such as asking check-up questions to make sure that the audience successfully follows the flow of speech (*Are you with me so far?, Before I go on, are there any questions about..?*) or painting word pictures (*Imagine..., Suppose....*).

The concept of metadiscourse can also cover the use of intertextual elements in formal spoken discourse. Plo (1996: 193) defines intertextuality as those “pre-texts” or “all influences which shape the text. Some of them very actively giving origin to citations, repetitions, comments or transformations in the final product while others are latent influences or even non-identifiable ones.” Rhetorically speaking, intertextual references (*according to ..., as X states, following X's approach*) provide credibility to statements and evidence of the speaker's knowledge of prior research in the topic. Citation has both textual and interpersonal functions. Academically, it demonstrates how current work builds on past work, situates the current research in a larger disciplinary narrative and helps define a specific context of knowledge. As a type of interpersonal metadiscourse, citations help writers establish a persuasive social and epistemological framework for acceptance of their claims. In addition, it also allows the speaker to show humility before the discourse community and to display allegiance to it and its orientation.

As the textbooks that illustrate this analysis point out, integrating visuals in the text –line graphs, flow charts, tables, etc.– is an important metadiscourse strategy in academic communication. Illustrations can be regarded as simplified pre-texts since they contain information which has been gathered and

prepared in advance by the speaker before delivering the talk. Acting as hypo-texts –to use Genette’s terminology (1982)–, visuals ought to be integrated in the flow of speech by overt metatextual references (*as you can see in your handouts..., if you have a look at this graph..., If you look at the screen you’ll see..*). The rhetorical effectiveness of illustrations lies in the fact that the speaker can illustrate concepts and interrelationships, synthesize information, highlight results and, ultimately, validate his/her own comments and suggestions. If analysed from the viewpoint of relevance and cognition, Hurst (1991) remarks that visuals “can show information which is not easily expressed in words [...]. They cause the audience to employ another sense to receive information, they bring variety and therefore increase the audience’s attention. They save time and they clarify complex information.”

In the same way as metadiscourse techniques are used in introductions and bodies of presentations, speech closures contain several metadiscourse techniques for effective communication. Ending an academic presentation often becomes an exercise of rhetoric and persuasion. As Martin (1989: 7) pointed out, academic discourse “is not simply analysing the world as it is and defending this interpretation,” but rather “making a suggestion as to how it should be changed.” In my experience, language acquisition should therefore concentrate on those rhetorical moves established by this genre: summarising the main points, relating conclusions to them, making recommendations or proposals, inviting questions and thanking the audience. According to the bibliographical sources of EAP university syllabuses, cause-effect relationships help convey a more solid argumentation of facts. Reason indicators and conclusion markers also work as metadiscourse devices to outline the validity of the statements and, similarly, hypothetical statements support the drawing of inferences or conclusions and present arguments as true and reasonable through a condition-consequence dichotomy.

In the final section of presentations, the speaker’s involvement also represents a good opportunity to approach listeners and convince them of the validity of the ideas presented. Cotton & Robbins (1997: 38) suggest a cyclic rhetorical framework for successful presentations: “to tell your audience what you’re going to say, say it, then tell the audience what you’ve said.” Metadiscourse references like “*to conclude,*” “*let me end by saying,*” “*finally, I’d like to say...,*” etc., allow the speaker to sum up the main ideas and introduce conclusive remarks in a pertinent way. However, depending on the interactional context, effective speech also requires rhetorical decisions about interpersonal intrusion in the text. In academic presentations speakers use language persuasively to force the audience to accept a new theory or implement a new analytical procedure, for example. There seems to be a

number of techniques with which speakers project themselves into the text to communicate integrity and involvement. The use of a 1st. person narration, for instance, explicitly reflects the speaker's commitment towards the topic and attempts to approach the audience more closely and convincingly. Speakers also highlight or downplay their own presence or that of their listeners by using other metadiscourse strategies like commenting on, alluding to their possible reactions to propositions in the text (*as is well known...*, *of course...*), directing the audience to parts of the text through imperatives (*Consider the case of...*, *Take the example of...*), or using pronouns strategically .

At other times, academic speech prefers the rhetorical technique of hedging the discourse to follow the premises of pragmatic politeness established by the academia. Due to the provisionality of the findings and the possibility of audience's counterargumentations, Skelton (1997: 133) explains that "[i]f [claims] are not to be taken as comments of certainty, they may be interpreted as representing possibilities (on the whole, rather than explicit suggestions) for future research." In this sense, it is important to develop an awareness of the relevance of contextualisation when considering grammatical and lexical choices. By this means the teaching process foregrounds the way language relates to the nature of the interaction and the roles of the participants.

Together with this broad coverage of techniques for effective communication, EAP courses on communication skills tend to emphasise the prosodic and paralinguistic devices of the language. Precisely, these can also be regarded as metadiscourse signposts since they explicitly reflect the social engagement between speaker and audience. Intonation, stress and rhythm, gestures and body language affect speech delivery and further enhance the rhetorical force of textual meanings when speaking in front of an audience. In current EAP tertiary education learners are expected to achieve an efficiently articulated speech, that is, a performance of high acceptability which involves "precision in the phonetic realization of phonemes" and "confident handling of accentual and intonation patterns" (Gimson & Cruttenden 1994: 273). The importance of prosody from a cognitive standpoint lies in that listeners have no access to the script of the speech and can not follow typographic cues to coherence and segmentation such as punctuation, headings, paragraphs or indentations. At a discourse level, through prosody the hearer processes coherence relations between utterances and discourse segments –or boundaries between two topics. To put an example, if discussed in relation to the concept of 'given' and 'new' information, Cruttenden (1997: 81) explains that for a new topic "the pitch reset [...] is boosted to show that it is not only the beginning of a new, grammatically-independent utterance but, more importantly, that it is also the beginning of a new section of the text." Another crucial aspect related to intonation is phrasing. Chunking a sentence into

phrases –tone units or intonation groups– will make pronunciation sound both more natural and more lively. For cognitive and pragmatic purposes, chunking helps listeners identify the speaker's intentions and personal commitment to what s/he is saying. Similarly, intonation provides cohesive links between sentences which can lead to disambiguation of textual meaning (Wichmann 2000), thus favouring information processing and seeking optimal relevance in communication.

At a rhetorical level, intonation also has an attitudinal function and can be manipulated by the speaker to vary textual meaning. Therefore, pitch movement can likewise be considered as a type of interpersonal metadiscourse underlying pragmatic purposes. Pitch changes can signal a shift of nucleus in a phrase where any word may carry primary accent and thus facilitate understanding of the speaker's stance beyond different probable textual meanings. For interpersonal purposes, effective speakers also use vocal underlining techniques like stressing a point (it is *vital, essential, imperative...*), stretching vowels (*these figures are extreemely useful*), repeating words or stressing the auxiliary verb or adding the appropriate auxiliary (*We do believe..., we did work...*). These can also be considered as metadiscourse devices since they consciously draw listeners' attention to a central topic and explicitly signal the speaker's special interest on a given point. In addition to intonation techniques, paralinguistic and extralinguistic devices such as the modulation of voice, pace of the delivery, showing enthusiasm and confidence in the talk or using body language are also foregrounded in university textbooks as useful rhetorical elements to sustain the flow of discourse and maintain the audience's interest in effective presentations. The following section reports on an experimental research project¹ that assessed the implementation of metadiscourse techniques in disciplinary communication in an EAP course at the University of Zaragoza (Spain).

3. Pedagogical procedures in the teaching of communication skills

The main purpose of the experimental research project reported in this section was to develop an awareness of metadiscourse techniques in an advanced classroom of EAP students and involved the following implementation procedures. Whereas the theoretical part of the lesson required a more teacher-controlled instructional method, learning by participants was largely practice-dependent. A problem-based methodology put students in charge of their own learning when they were asked to

¹ Perez-Llantada et al. 2002 "Implementation of corpus linguistics for the development of listening and speaking skills in EAP/ESP university courses". Proyecto de Innovación Docente 245-91 funded by the Instituto de las Ciencias de la Educación, University of Zaragoza. (For further information see Memoria de Proyectos de Innovación Docente at <http://www.unizar.es/ice>)

apply their formal knowledge on metadiscourse strategies in a real life situation: delivering a talk in class.

The problem-solving activity involved making small groups, carrying out research on a technical topic of their interest, preparing the script of the speech and, finally, delivering it in front of their classmates. The starting point of the task was the search for information in the net using well-known search engines such as Google. By doing this learners became acquainted with the advantages of developing critical reading skills when using the Internet as a source of information. Once relevant data was collected group dynamics entailed distributing roles and tasks, taking decisions, sharing opinions, even helping the others with learning difficulties. Teamwork cooperation, creativity, and an autonomous, learner-centred model of education drew students towards more mature and conscious attitudes concerning language acquisition.

On the one hand, the teacher's role was to monitor students in their learning activities, thus using a more constructivist and collaborative method of instruction. Following Arnold's approach (1999) the teacher acted as a counselor, became acquainted with students' learning routines and problems and made them more comfortable on the day of the presentation – although in general the rapport of the class was usually adequate for an open and relaxed communication. On the other hand, when “learning through doing,” students turned out to be extrovert and self-confident, as well as self-efficient and positively committed in carrying out tasks mainly due to their instrumental motivation. Cohesiveness, good member interrelationships and tolerance rather than competitiveness often reduced speech anxiety or “stage fright” when considering the social evaluation of the performance.

As in any other pedagogical procedure, the final stage of the teaching process examined students' communication proficiency, learning skills, personal development and social skills. Evaluation served to assess teaching/learning approaches on the basis of the performance of the learners and their reactions to instructional practice. In this sense, videotaping the presentations and creating our own learner corpus was a valuable source of feedback. Recordings were used as an assessment basis from three complementary points of view: the speakers themselves, colleagues and the instructor/teacher. By completing a self-evaluation sheet (see Appendix), the student's self-correction proved to elicit a more conscious learning and fostered a greater interest in the process of language acquisition. Generally speaking, classroom routine demonstrated that these university students coped with their own mistakes easily, found ways to solve them, and showed interest in avoiding them again.

A similar questionnaire on strengths and weaknesses was also given to the audience to evaluate peers' performance. In their role of observers, learners developed greater awareness of the role of metadiscourse for effective communication: speaking without grammar or pronunciation mistakes, using macro- and micro-markers for discourse coherence and cohesion, following both rhetorical moves and genre conventions, facetalking, etc. As far as teacher's feedback was concerned, evaluating students' presentations under planned conditions was based on the three variables pointed out by Foster and Skehan (1996): complexity, accuracy and fluency. In contrast to unplanned oral production, our learner corpus revealed that complexity of language –clauses per unit– had undergone greater syntactic and lexical variety, although in general, learners stuck to the well-known principle of technical communication: “maximum amount of information with a minimum number of words.” Presentations also displayed an acceptable level of accuracy in speech production; they were usually error-free with regards to syntax, morphology and word order since they had gone through the tutor's correction before classroom performance. Also, under planned conditions, greater fluency in language was achieved. As a result, fewer repetitions, reformulations, replacements, false starts, pauses, and silences were observed in the recordings.

Broadly speaking, students became successful communicators with regards to metadiscourse strategies. They encoded semantic meaning through the adequate lexical, grammatical and functional choices and they followed a coherent and cohesive organisation of ideas complying with the rhetorical moves and conventions of the genre. Discourse markers were used to signal the organising framework of the text and its different sections or topics, and metatextual references allowed more fluid expression and easier speech processing. Also, both intertextual references and visuals were integrated in the speech and used for cognitive and pragmatic purposes. In addition, other metadiscourse techniques were employed for effective speech, above all, comparisons and contrasts, cause-effect relationships, rhetorical questions, explanations and paraphrases.

In general terms, learners showed an acceptable mastery of critical thinking, metadiscourse skills and collaborative learning. However, a few weaknesses were observed in students' performance: some pronunciation mistakes, minor grammatical inaccuracies (*people who is, can to, importants, etc.*), lexical transfers from L1 to L2, incorrect spellings in transparencies. At times we still found problems concerning psychological factors related to “speaking to the whole class,” mainly failure to control anxiety and, very rarely, lack of preparation.

By recording learners' performance, it was extremely useful to raise awareness of different problems of speech that can be avoided by learning metadiscourse. Evaluation served to analyse

communication breakdowns caused by incorrect pronunciation or by interruptions from the audience, to make students acquainted with compensation strategies such as paraphrases, synonyms, circumlocution, rephrasing, gestures, etc., to check their degree of self-confidence in communication –slips of grammar, halts and hesitation, loss of memory, etc., and to identify other communication difficulties such as distractions, speech too fast, too much information, too many new words or even background noise. In the light of individual, group and teacher feedback, the teachers/researchers involved in the project found it very convenient to provide follow-up repair exercises to solve learning and linguistic problems successfully.

4. Conclusions and pedagogical implications

This paper has outlined how Spanish EAP university syllabuses approach academic monologic speech as entailing a rhetorically complex reporting of facts. In conclusion, seems that the task of university students is to learn not only how to describe feasible applications of disciplinary knowledge in the most accurate way but also to use the ‘art’ of rhetoric and persuasion to convince their audience of the validity of their proposals.

As experimental research has proved, metadiscourse contains an enormous potential for teaching and learning communication skills successfully. But perhaps the emphasis should be placed in the fact that through the adequate methodology and classroom implementation metadiscourse can also play a relevant role for developing students’ awareness of the cognitive and social aspects of language. In the light of cognition, if language learning concentrates on the way genres are produced and processed, students will better understand the importance of those conceptual mappings that facilitate information processing. From the perspective of social pragmatics, learners’ awareness of the rules of social and institutional communication will surely make them realise how every register should be regarded as a language variation determined by the agreed organisational routines of a given discourse community.

Bibliographical references

Arnold, J. ed. 1999. *Affect in Language Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Barras, R. (1978). *Scientists Must Write. A Guide to Better Writing for Scientists, Engineers and Students*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Biber, D. & E. Finnegan eds 1994. *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*. New York, Oxford: OUP.
- Blakemore, D. 2002. *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning. The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Canale, M & M. Swain. 1980. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing" *Applied Linguistics*, vol. n° 1. pp. 1-47.
- Comfort, J. 1995. *Effective Presentations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cotton, D. & S. Robbins 1997. *Business Class*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Cruttenden, A. 1997 *Intonation*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Day, R. 1979. *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Estaire, S & J. Zanón. 1994. *Planning Classwork. A task based approach*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Ferguson, G. 2002. Recent developments in the teaching of English for Specific Purposes." Unpublished classnotes, ICE, University of Zaragoza.
- Foster, P. & P. Skehan. 1996. "The Influence of planning and task type on second language performance." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* vol 18 n° 3, pp. 299-323
- Genette, G. 1982. *Palimpsestes. La Littérature au second degré*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Gimson, A.C. & A. Cruttenden. 1994. *Pronunciation in English*. London, Sidney, Auckland: Arnold
- Bernice Hurst. 1991. *The Handbook of Communication Skills*. London: Kogan Page.
- Hyland, K. 1998. "Persuasion and context: the pragmatics of academic metadiscourse." *Journal of Pragmatics* 30, 437-455.
- Hyland, K. 2000. *Disciplinary Discourses. Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Johns, A. M. 1997. *Text, Role and Context. Developing Academic Literacies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G. & E. Kellerman eds. 1997. *Communication Strategies. Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London & New York: Longman.
- Mauranen, A. 1993. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: A Textlinguistic Study*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Mauranen, A. 1998. "Another Look at Genre: Corpus Linguistics vs. Genre Analysis". In *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* XXXIII, pp. 303-315.

- Mauranen, A. 1999. "Reflexive Academic Talk. Observations from MICASE " in R. Simpson & J. Swales eds. *Corpus Linguistics in North America. Selections from the 1999 Symposium*. Ann Arbor: the University of Michigan Press, pp. 165-178.
- Mortara Garavelli, B. 1991. (1988). *Manual de retórica*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Perelman, Ch. & L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. 1994. *Tratado de la argumentación. La nueva retórica*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Plo, R. 1996. "Several Pre-texts in Scientific Writing." in B. Penas ed. *The Intertextual Dimension of Discourse. Pragmalinguistic-Cognitive-Hermeneutic approaches*. Zaragoza: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Powell, M. 2001. *Presenting in English*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- Reppen, R., S.M. Fitzmaurice & D. Biber eds. 2002. *Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Scharle & Szabó. 2000. *Learner Autonomy. A Guide to Developing Learner Responsibility*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Skelton, J. 1997. "The Representation of Truth in Academic Medical Writing". *Applied Linguistics* 18, 2, pp. 121-140.
- Swales, J.M. 2001. "Metatalk in American Academic Talk" *Journal of English Linguistics* vol. 29, nº 1, pp. 34-54.
- Sweeney, S. 1997. *English for Business Communication*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Reinhart, S.M. 2002. *Giving Academic Presentations*. Ann Arbor: the University of Michigan Press.
- Tannen, D. & C. Wallat 1999. "Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction: examples from a medical examination/interview," in A. Jaworski & N. Coupland eds. *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge, pp: 348-363.
- Thompson, S.E. 2003 "Text-structuring metadiscourse, intonation and the signalling of organisation in academic lectures" *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2, pp. 5-20.
- Ventola, E. & A. Mauranen 1991. "Non-native writing and native revising of scientific articles," in E. Ventola ed. *Functional and Systemic Linguistics. Approaches and Uses*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wichmann, A. 2000. *Intonation in Text and Discourse. Beginnings, Middles, Ends*. Harlow, Essex: Pearsons Education Ltd.
- Wilkinson, A. 1991. *The Scientist's Handbook for Writing Papers and Dissertations*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Wilson, D. & D. Sperber 1998. "Pragmatics and Time," in R. Carston & S. Uchida. *Relevance Theory. Applications and Implications*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

SELF-EVALUATION SHEET									
ORAL PRESENTATION SKILLS	yes/no How could you improve on this skill?								
1. FLUENCY									
Did you often stop and hesitate before starting a new sentence?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>								
..... before starting a difficult word?									
..... searching for the suitable word?									
2. GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY									
Did you make any mistakes that were not in the written draft?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>								
Did you make the same mistake several times? What was this?									
3. PRONUNCIATION									
On the whole, did you find your pronunciation natural?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>								
Did you mispronounce something you normally know? What was this?									
Did you have a general problem with particular sounds? Which ones?									
.....									
4. STRESS AND INTONATION									
On the whole, did you find stress and intonation natural?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>								
Did you notice any problems with a particular sentence type or intonation pattern? Or any words with the wrong stress?									
.....									
5. STRUCTURE									
Did you find your talk logically structured?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>								
Was it easy to follow? Why/Why not?.....									
6. COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES									
Did you use cohesive markers to guide the audience?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 20px;"></td><td style="width: 150px; height: 20px;"></td></tr> </table>								
Did you find any problems in using any particular techniques? Which ones?									
Do you think techniques for effective communication have been useful in your presentation? Which ones?.....									
FURTHER COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS:									
.....									
.....									
.....									
.....									
.....									

Pérez-Llantada, Carmen. 2003. Communication Skills in Academic Monologue Discourse. Empirical and Applied Perspectives. *Círculo de lingüística aplicada a la comunicación* 15, 37-51. Universidad Complutense de Madrid, ISSN 1576-4737, <https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/CLAC>.

Published: February 4, 2003

Updated pdf: March 20, 2023