

Academic speaking, implications for policy and practice

CLENTON Jon

Introduction

Academic speaking forms part of pre-sessional and in-sessional courses at most universities in the UK (Eds. Adams, Heaton & Howarth, 1991), and it is generally organised around two central academic activities: presentation skills and seminar participation (McCormack & Watkins, 2012; Anderson, Lynch & Maclean, 2004). There are several textbooks on the market that purport to inform second language (L2) academic speaking at university level, but superficial analysis of their content suggests that the focus is on creating practice opportunities and encouraging the development of useful study skills as opposed to what specific language learners are likely to need or encounter in academic settings. Formulaic expressions to express functions are presented in “useful language” boxes (McCormack & Watkins, 2012), and learners are required to practice using them, but a comparison of these ready-made expressions with videos and transcripts of authentic seminars (British Academic Spoken English (BASE), refer to Appendix 2 for example transcripts) begs the question of how representative such expressions are of genuine academic language. The current paper intends to describe the language in use of seminars in the UK on the basis of transcripts from the BASE corpus, as well as to discuss potential implications for teachers and learners alike. We use the term ‘seminar’ to refer to academic settings in which speaking is anticipated and required by students, as opposed to Lectures where we anticipate it is not. The paper begins by examining some of the central theories of what the speaking process involves, and what is known about L2 speaking. Having described what is involved in the speaking process, what follows is a description of the different types of seminar activity in UK universities, along with commentary outlining why writing appropriate English for Academic Purposes (EAP) materials for students might be problematic. The paper then outlines conversational functions and skills required for academic interaction as traditionally identified by EAP textbooks (e.g. McCormack & Watkins, 2012; Anderson, Lynch & Maclean, 2004). This is followed by a discussion of areas of the spoken language, informed by videos of authentic seminars that could usefully be included in a typical academic speaking course. Finally, implications for learning are

summarized. Reference is made to potential ideas for tasks and activities (refer to Appendix 1).

Speaking and Second Language Acquisition

We begin by outlining the speaking process along with what is known about second language (L2) speaking. Once we scan several researchers in this area, we begin to observe that the speaking process is far from a simple one. For instance, in Kormos' words "(o)ne of the most complex automatic human activities is linguistically encoding what one wants to say in his or her mother tongue" (2006, p.38). Similarly, Martinez-Flor, Usó-Juan and Alcón Soler's (2006) model of communicative competence appears to demonstrate the wide range and different kinds of knowledge required, including: linguistic, pragmatic, intercultural, strategic, as well as discourse competences. Levelt's (1989) famous model of speech processing, originally designed to describe monolingual processing, and subsequently adapted by de Bot (1992) to schematize the processes involved in L2 speech, illustrates the many cognitive processes involved. Levelt's speech production model has three stages: speech is first conceptualized; second, it is formulated or encoded; and, third, and finally, it is articulated. In addition to speech production, we can also consider Levelt's model in terms of speech perception, as well as stores of knowledge. As for speech perception, and this includes the notion of self-monitoring: first the acoustic-phonetic processor perceives speech; second, the speech comprehension system or parser decodes speech; and then third, and finally, the conceptualiser interprets the speech. Similarly, there are also three stores of knowledge, namely: the lexicon; the syllabary containing phonological information; and, knowledge of the external and internal world, including discourse models and situational and encyclopedic knowledge (Dornyei & Kormos, 1998).

Once we explore each of Levelt's three processes we begin to observe just how complex speech production might be. For instance, Levelt's first stage in speech production, conceptualization, is considered to be a pre-verbal stage that involves both macro-planning and micro-planning, and each utterance must then be formulated, requiring choices regarding syntax, individual words and phrases, and phonological encoding. As Thornbury (2005) points out such syntactic encoding is influenced by working memory as well as how much information can be held at any one time. As such, the limited planning time allowed for in spontaneous speech results typically in the chaining together of disjointed phrases,

particularly when taking long turns. The pressure of working in real time might also lead to production slips in word choice and/or pronunciation. A phonetic plan (of internal speech) is then converted into overt speech by the articulator. Such planning or self-monitoring, according to Levelt's speech processing model, takes place at each of the three speech processing stages: during conceptualisation, during formulation, and after articulation; as well as during any noticing of errors that may result in repair (repair includes many of the characteristics of spontaneous spoken language e.g. hesitations, dysfluent pauses, repetition, rephrasing, and self-correcting. To further add to the complexity, as Thornbury (2005) observes, when speech involves interaction, it is contingent that each utterance depends on the interlocutor's previous utterance. As such, planning may overlap with the production of the speaker's own previous utterance; consequently, parallel processes require considerable automaticity if speech is to be considered 'fluent'.

Turning our attention to second language speakers, we can anticipate that being considered 'fluent' might be quite a significant goal. For instance, De Bot (1992) argued that the speech of L2 speakers is generally slower and more hesitant when compared to that of L1 (first language) speech and adapted Levelt's model to illustrate the reasons for this. Whereas processing by the formulator and the articulator is considered to be simultaneous and automatic in the L1, for the L2, the speaker's attention is essential during the grammatical and phonological encoding phases, and, as a consequence, part of the output is therefore processed serially. The fact that the L2 speaker's attentional resources appear to be so heavily burdened implies that their short term memory, therefore, is not free to focus on conceptualising and formulating the message (Thornbury, 2005). De Bot also highlights that L2 speakers often lack the language competence required to express themselves, and that L1 transfer can influence the L2 verbalisation process. DeBot (1992) claims that L2 words are stored in the L1 lexicon as a subset, and that the conceptualiser contains a language-specifying feature which selects the language of the message and informs the formulator (Dornyei & Kormos, 1998). This perception of a shared lexicon for both the L1 and the L2 words, and the implied theory that L1 and L2 sounds are in a common syllabary might help to account for why L1-L2 interference occurs.

Indeed, others have commented on the relevant processes required by L2 speakers in order to be considered fluent. For instance, cognitivists such as Anderson with his 'Adaptive Control of Thought theory' (1996), and McLaughlin with his 'Information Processing Model'

(2004) both appear to suggest that it is practice that language learners move from controlled to automatic processing. Anderson argues that language learning is a skill, and that such a skill involves progressing through stages: from declarative to procedural, and finally to an 'automatic' stage. Similarly, McLaughlin (1990) claims that controlled processing leads to restructuring and eventual automatising. However, based on the assumption that university students at the Common European Framework (CEFR) B2/C1 level might already have achieved what is considered to be an acceptable level of fluency, Thornbury's (2005) suggested model of awareness-raising → appropriation → autonomy might appear to be the more relevant approach to learning (in which learners progress through 'texts' from first having their awareness of relevant language raised, to which they then appropriate, or guess approximately how to use, and move onto a final stage in which the L2 learners use the language autonomously or independently). Carter and McCarthy's (1997) three I's approach: Illustration → Interaction → Induction, with its emphasis on real data, (in which learners are presented with language, the 'Illustration' stage, they then 'Interact' in a practice session, and finally are 'inducted' into genuine L2 contexts (e.g. seminars); the emphasis is on discussion about the language observed and on noticing, and is also reflected in many of the task types later proposed in this paper.

UK Academia and EAP material writing

In terms of the broad aims of this paper, to determine how best L2 learners can prepare for university seminars, a description of the different types of seminar activity appears useful. Furneaux, Locke, Robinson, and Tonkyn (1991) categorise seminar activities as follows:

- student group work, such as collaborating on a problem-solving exercise
- question-and-answer lessons led by instructors
- plenary discussions based on assigned reading
- presentations by class members, followed by discussion

Naturally, student roles will vary, according to activity type, such as where some involve seminar participants in processes of "mutual discovery", others where instructors take the lead. However, it is clear from the short interviews with lecturers and academics conducted at the University of Warwick (Essential Academic Skills in English, 2005), and also from videos produced for the official website of the University of Nottingham (University

of Nottingham, nd) that students are expected to participate in discussions and exchange views on topics that they have previously prepared. The implication from such video data, therefore, appears to be that learners need awareness-raising and training in areas such as asking questions, organising and signposting ideas, hedging, signaling listenership, and convergence (O’Keefe, McCarthy & Carter, 2007). In addition, the importance of knowing enough topic-specific lexis is also an area that should be stressed. As Furneaux et al. (1991) remark, English for Academic Purposes (EAP) teachers need to be aware of how seminars are run in different departments so that they can inform students about what to expect and about what might be expected of them. As we go onto observe later in this paper, the most effective means doing that appears to be via the use of authentic seminar videos, which might be used to develop motivating and immediately appropriate/relevant teaching materials.

Nevertheless, despite the obvious appreciation that roles are forever changing and that authentic materials might be a step forward in the right direction, there does appear to be a paucity of such relevant and current materials. For instance, in Lynch and Anderson’s chapter “Do you mind if I come in here?” (1991), the authors criticise materials of the phrasebook type, for offering lists of alternative formulae for realising a particular function, such as agreeing and disagreeing, with occasional glosses such as “informal” or “very formal”. Lynch and Anderson argue that observation of real seminars should show that participants, whether L1 or L2 speakers, tend not to express communicative functions in the means suggested in such textbooks, that such lists are more likely based on language teachers’ notions of what people say, rather than on genuine data. Despite the fact that this particular chapter was written twenty-five years ago, the advance of corpora such as BASE and the opportunity to observe authentic data that these offer appears to demonstrate that little has changed. This is compounded with even a recent survey of EAP materials, such as Appleby, 2012, who suggests giving students exponents for functions such as ‘asking for clarification’ requiring such students to grade functions according to formality. Lynch and Anderson (1991) also claim that listening materials in EAP textbooks lack authenticity: scripted conversations pruned of the features of natural interaction are read aloud, corroborated by McCormack and Watkins’ (2012) recent textbook. Based on such paucity, Lynch and Anderson rightly propose that ‘(i)f we want to provide insights into what goes on in seminars, then we need to *show* what goes on in seminars’.

Before forging ahead and bombarding EAP students with such authentic materials, there appear to be a number of practical hurdles we might need to overcome, not least the issue of filming and exploiting university seminars as teaching materials. At the production end, there appear to be immediate concerns in light of the seeming intrusion of cameras, as well as potential ethical considerations and complications; similarly, at the exploitation end, there remains the issue of subject-specific content in some disciplines, as well as the issue of 'length' of seminars (Lynch & Anderson, 1991). Accordingly, materials writing, therefore, should involve careful selection and editing of video material and transcripts to ensure that careful identified and chosen extracts are accessible to lay students, are stimulating, revealing, and of course, relevant to individual need.

As well as considering the kinds of activities L2 EAP learners should practice, we also need to consider the relevant skills and conversational functions that EAP textbooks (McCormack & Watkins, 2012; Anderson, Lynch & Maclean, 2001) typically prioritize for seminar participation. To briefly summarise these texts, then, EAP preparation of functions should include the ability to:

- structure and express ideas coherently
- take turns, and avoid inappropriate interruptions
- express opinions, agree, disagree, ask questions, clarify, confirm understanding
- chair discussions
- summarize ideas, report back on group discussions
- demonstrate that learners consider contrasting opinions
- define key terms, refer to sources, describe data

Such functions appear appropriate for academic interaction, but greater thought perhaps ought to be given to teaching methodology. The controlled speaking and listening exercises criticised by Lynch and Anderson (1991) result in the overuse of unnatural-sounding memorised conversation gambits such as the one selected for the title of their chapter: "Do you mind if I come in here?" Unsurprisingly, a search in BASE for such ready-made phrases does not generate any results. It, therefore, does not appear to be an overstatement to suggest that listening and speaking tasks might be more immediately appropriate and, as such, motivating and inspiring, if extracted from authentic materials (as opposed to the memorized conversation gambits Lynch and Anderson refer to).

An examination of BASE videos from two different disciplines, Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences, suggests that there are several areas of the spoken language that might usefully be explored in the EAP classroom. One such case suggests that it might be interesting for learners to focus on register in order to determine the extent to which seminar language is more formal than casual everyday conversation. By focusing on register, L2 learners could explore the use of subject-specific lexis and greater lexical breadth, enriched by preparatory reading, and longer turns that might involve a higher level of organisation of content. Similarly, learners might be surprised to notice that vague and approximative language such as *as sort of*, *like*, *kind of*, *stuff*, and *things like that*, typically discouraged in academic writing, appear to be commonplace in academic seminars, if we use the BASE videos as our source. Moreover, hesitations, fillers, repetitions and false starts, ubiquitous in mundane chat, (O'Keefe, McCarthy, & Carter, 2007) might reveal themselves to be equally common in seminar discussion, according to the speaker and the complexity of the topic. Awareness-raising of such features of spoken language could be followed by discussion of how desirable or useful they might be (see Appendix 1, exercise 1). As Basturkmen (2002) implies, L2 learners may not want to pragmatically behave like L1 speakers, but at least after exploring authentic discourse, they might then be able to make informed choices. In this very respect, presenting learners with such authentic materials appears to suggest that L2 learners can only benefit from such knowledge, once presented with the opportunity to decide what to do with such (pragmatic) information.

Altenberg (1998) asserted that as many as 80% of the words in the London-Lund corpus of spoken English are included in formulaic sequences. Accordingly, formulaic sequences are a feature of both written and spoken language that learners at all levels might usefully explore. It is widely recognised that L1 speakers make extensive use of formulaic sequences (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Schmitt, ed., 2004; Wray, 2002). Discussion related precisely to what formulaic sequences might be vary, but taxonomies (Wray, 2002; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992) include collocations, binominals and trinominals, multi-word verbs, phatic expressions, conversational routines, fillers, sentence frames, and expressions of discourse organisation. They can be idiomatic or literal, completely fixed or contain open slots which allow variation, and they have an enormous value in their capacity to express concepts economically, efficiently and unambiguously. Research implies that those L2 learners who incorporate such lexical

phrases into their own speech are perceived as being more fluent (Wood, 2009; Boers, Demecheleer, Eyckmans, Kappel & Stengers, 2006). Others also claim (Pawley & Syder, 1983) that such phrases present a processing advantage over sequences of words generated creatively (or, non-formulaic sequences), if committed to long-term memory as single units, and can be retrieved as “unanalysed wholes”, or with the minimum of encoding if there are open slots to fill. Such commitment (to long-term memory) frees up the working memory so that speakers can then focus on comprehending and planning. The implication from such psycholinguistic theory is that occasional activities that involve identifying and practicing formulaic sequences, with a view to moving them from appropriation to autonomy, might be beneficial. Accordingly, phrases or sequences could be extracted from authentic seminar transcripts of, and then recycled in the form of gapped texts to help L2 learners commit to the long-term memory (see Appendix 1, exercise 2).

Similarly, and according to Simpson and Mendis (2003), a focus on idiomatic expressions and their pragmatic functions would also be useful for EAP L2 learners. Despite their relatively low frequency and their association with everyday informal conversation (because of their mainly evaluative nature (O’Keefe et al., 2007)), Simpson and Mendis advocate the study of idiomatic expressions in academic speech as “a key to nativelike fluency” (p.420). While awareness-raising in context would likely suffice, as the use of idiomatic language is idiosyncratic, it may not appeal to all L2 speakers.

Another important consideration for inclusion in seminar preparation might be the use of hedging. Some of the most frequent chunks of language have a hedging function, as they soften utterances to appear less assertive and less open to challenge (O’Keefe et al., 2007). In academic discussion, speakers generally take care not to sound too blunt or categorical, and speakers do this by conveying uncertainty. Expressions such as *I think, a bit, I don’t know whether, just, kind of, actually, probably* and modals (such as *might* or *could*) tone down the force of an opinion. Again, consciousness-raising of the phenomenon with a focus on language in use using authentic video recordings and transcripts, as Carter and McCarthy (1997) propose in their three I’s approach, followed by class discussion about function and desirability might be culturally appealing. (Appendix 1, exercise 1).

Similarly, and seemingly essential for a seminar preparation, is the importance of ‘turn-taking’. Famously described by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), the founders of

Conversation Analysis (CA), turn-taking takes the form of speakers and listeners collaborating for conversational coherence. Knowing when the right moment to intervene is, in CA terms-recognising the transition relevance point (TRP), can be difficult for L2 learners as it requires accurate listening and “split-second timing” (Hughes, 2006, p.220). Already seemingly burdened by the demands of needing to comprehend as well as process speech, the L2 listener has a number of tasks to consider in turn-taking. L2 learners need to predict possible grammatical endings of clauses, recognise signals in the speaker’s prosody (such as intonation, loudness, speed), and observe the speaker’s use of body language to time entry into interaction. Hughes argues that learners benefit from help in recognising these signals with the use of video, so by observing what might be successful and where turn-taking is unsuccessful, students can learn to avoid and repair accidental interruptions. Another additional consideration is the importance of cultural variance. As Cameron rightly highlights (2001), turn-taking conventions can vary according to culture. Knowing when it is acceptable to intervene, therefore, appears to form part of each learner’s pragmatic linguistic competence. Furneaux et al. (1991), by contrast, report that for most students practice in “breaking into the discussion” (p.84) is not particularly useful, as they report only seven per cent of their L2 students as indicating difficulty finding opportunities to speak.

CA draws a distinction between casual talk-in-interaction and interaction in institutional settings, and seminar discussions are examples of the latter. In institutional interaction, the context will dictate the turn-taking conventions: it will often be the seminar leader who allocates turns by nominating participants to answer questions, rather than the participants who self-select. Moreover, in some seminars participants will raise their hand to indicate they want to speak. Turn-taking, along with other CA issues, such as adjacency pairs (question and answer, opinion and agreement/disagreement), repair, and the use of discourse markers to mark topic boundaries, manage turns, and signpost stance (*well, actually, essentially/basically, on the other hand*) are best focused on using authentic data.

Hughes (2006) also talks about the importance of response tokens in her chapter, and although backchannels are probably used less in seminar discussion at class level than in casual conversation, a focus on how mutually supportive interaction is established in seminars would be interesting. (Appendix 1, exercise 3). As O’Keefe et al. (2007) point out, a socio-culturally inspired view of conversation sees participants as supporting or, in Vygotsky’s

terms, “scaffolding” each other’s performance. The flow of conversation is a joint responsibility, and this leads O’Keefe et al. to talk about the importance of “confluence” rather than fluency (p.158).

Much of the lexis required by university students to participate in seminars is subject-specific, but the importance of good learning strategies should be emphasised in the EAP classroom. A focus on topic-specific language and how it serves to elevate and differentiate “academic” from casual interaction could again be informed by authentic transcripts. Once interesting language has been identified, it would be useful to discuss ways of keeping records of new words and expressions, including by recording them orally. Recycling is also crucial, and quick exercises in the form of gapped sentences could be devised to test selected expressions in subsequent lessons. Once examples have been provided, the teacher could ask learners to write these tests themselves and test their peers. In this way learners choose the expressions that interest them most, and deepen their own understanding of how the lexis is used. Lessons that are learner-centred are preferable at university level, as they enhance learner autonomy, motivation and deeper processing of knowledge. (Appendix 1, exercise 2).

Finally, a focus on elements of prosody is essential to any speaking course. The way speakers can add emphasis to their speech through the use of stress and intonation, how they pause for effect, and how they chunk utterances into tone units are features of the spoken language that can easily be incorporated into lessons using extracts from authentic models. Handouts of transcripts could be annotated as learners listen to speakers, and the effectiveness of the speakers’ delivery subsequently discussed at plenary level. Learners could be encouraged to shadow-read good speakers to improve their own performance.

Discussion

Many issues have been raised in this paper, but the term “awareness-raising” has been recurrent. Rigggenbach (1990) and later Basturkmen (2002) advocate a “learners-as-observers-of-discourse” approach. They argue that L2 speakers, like discourse analysts, can learn about speech by observing and analysing authentic samples, and that this will lead to them improving their own performances. Basturkmen (2002) recounts how her learners also record themselves, incorporating the language and strategies previously discussed, and then reflect

on how they could improve. They also record themselves discussing a prepared topic before viewing an authentic discussion on the same topic and comparing their performance with the video. The “learners-as-observers-of-discourse” approach is reminiscent of Carter and McCarthy’s (1997) three I’s in the importance given to real data, the discussion of the strategies and language observed, and subsequent appropriation of the language.

A term often used when learners’ attention is drawn to target language is “noticing”. An influential advocate of noticing was Schmidt in the 1990s (Mitchell & Myers, 2004), and Boers et al. (2006) and Wood (2009) demonstrate its effectiveness in their studies, where noticing was used to help learners acquire formulaic sequences in their spoken language. Lynch (2007) describes another study where learners are required to notice their own language. First they record themselves performing a role-play, then they transcribe it and collaborate on correcting and improving it themselves, before receiving teacher feedback and repeating the role-play. Lynch claims that the greater “depth of processing” (p.312) involved in this collaborative process, although time-consuming, benefits long-term learning. In Lynch’s study learners also use their recordings to comment on their own fluency, evaluating their pace, pausing, and use of fillers and hesitations. In short, self-awareness, although initially painful, can be a first step in the learning process.

As far as practice is concerned, the opportunity to repeat a communicative task, as in Lynch and Maclean’s (2001) poster “carousel” study, seems highly appropriate in academic speaking. By repeating and recycling language, learners can gain confidence, improve their performance, and increase their automaticity. The task can easily be adapted, for example students could read different articles prior to the lesson, or study different theories, and then exchange information in class with revolving interlocutors. If they are also required to take notes and tell new partners what they have learnt, their ability to communicate successfully and negotiate meaning is tested in greater depth. According to a psycholinguistic perspective on language learning, output and interaction play a key role (Mitchell & Myers, 2004). The opportunity to negotiate meaning when communication breakdown occurs helps learners process language and learn through feedback, recasts, confirmation checks and requests for clarification.

Conclusion

A central tenet of this essay is that EAP materials writers and teachers require access

to authentic videos of a variety of seminar types in different disciplines, involving both L1 and L2 speakers, in order to develop stimulating materials that prepare learners for the reality of seminar participation. These materials will demonstrate language in use i.e. real models and not scripts based on EAP teachers' notions of what people say. The ideas put forward in this essay are inspired by what is known about the speaking process and some of the many theories of SLA. It is recognised that the study is limited, for example, it only draws on BASE seminars from two different faculties: Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences. However, it is intended to suggest an approach to preparing teaching and learning materials for young adults at B2/C1 level in higher education. Vygotsky was mentioned earlier, and the essay will conclude by referring again to the socio-cultural view that learning is a socially situated activity, and cognitive development depends on social interaction. Guidance and collaboration enable learners to develop, and this scaffolding can come from both teachers and peers. Seminars provide the ideal opportunity for a collaborative learning process.

References

- Adams, P., Heaton, B., & Howarth, P. (Eds.). (1991). *Socio-cultural issues in English for specific purposes*. London: Modern English Publications.
- Altenberg, B. (1998). On the phraseology of spoken English: the evidence of recurrent word combinations. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications*. (pp.101-22). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, K., Maclean, J., & Lynch, T. (2004). *Study speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (2004) 428.24-AND 3rd floor
- Appleby, R. (2012). Teaching Speaking for Academic Purposes. *English Language Teaching Global Blog*. Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, J. R. (1996). ACT: A simple theory of complex cognition. *American Psychologist*, 51: 355-365.
- Basturkmen, H. (2002) Learner observation of, and reflection on, spoken discourse: an approach for teaching academic speaking. *TESOL Journal*, 11: 26-30.
- Boers, F., Demecheleer, M., Eyckmans, J., Kappel, J & Stengers, H. (2006). Formulaic sequences and perceived oral proficiency: putting a lexical approach to the test. *Language Teaching Research*, 10: 245-261.
- British Academic Spoken English (BASE): <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/research/collect/base/>
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Bot, K. (1992). A bilingual production model: Levelt's 'speaking' model adapted. *Applied*

Linguistics, 13: 1-24.

- Dorsey, Z. & Kormos, J. (1998). Problem-solving mechanisms in L2 communication. A Psycholinguistic perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20: 349-385.
- Essential Academic Skills in English (EASE) (nd). The University of Warwick. <http://moodle.globalpad.net/course/view.php?id=14>
- Furneaux, C., Locke, C., Robinson, P., & Tonkyn, A. (1991) Talking heads and shifting bottoms: the ethnography of academic seminars. In P. Adams, B. Heaton & P. Howarth (Eds.), *Socio-cultural issues in English for specific purposes* (pp. 74-87). London: Modern English Publications.
- Kormos, J. (2006). *Speech production and second language acquisition*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hughes, R. (2006). Turn-taking awareness: benefits for teaching speaking skills in academic and other contexts. In E. Usó-Juan & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.) *Current trends in the development and teaching of the four language skills*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Levelt W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: from intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levelt W. J. M. (1995). The ability to speak: from intentions to spoken words. *European Review*, 3: 13-23.
- Lynch, T. & Anderson, K. (1991). Do you mind if I come in here? A comparison of EAP seminar/discussion materials and the characteristics of real academic interaction. In P. Adams, B. Heaton & P. Howarth (Eds.), *Socio-cultural issues in English for specific purposes* (pp. 88-99). London: Modern English Publications.
- Lynch, T. (2007). Learning from the transcripts of an oral communication task. *ELT Journal*, 61: 311-320.
- Lynch, T. & Maclean, J. (2001). Exploring the benefits of task repetition and recycling for classroom language learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 4: 221-250.
- Martínez-Flor, A., Usó-Juan, E., & Alcón Soler, E. (2006). Towards acquiring communicative competence through speaking. In E. Usó-Juan & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.) *Current trends in the development and teaching of the four language skills*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McCormack, J. & Watkins, S. (2012) *English for Academic Study: Speaking*. Reading: Garnett Press.
- McLaughlin, B. (1990). Restructuring. *Applied Linguistics*, 11: 113-128.
- Mitchell, R., & Myers, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories. 2nd edition*. London: Arnold.
- Nattinger, J. R. & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Keefe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007). *From corpus to classroom. Language use and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pawley, A. & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication*. (pp.191-225) London: Longman.

- Riggenbach, H. (1990). Discourse analysis and spoken language instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11: 152-163.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50: 696-735.
- Schmitt, N. (Ed.). (2004). *Formulaic sequences. Acquisition, processing and use*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Simpson, S. & Mendis, D. (2003). A corpus-based study of idioms in academic speech. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37: 419-441.
- Thornbury, S. (1997). Reformulation and reconstruction: tasks that promote 'noticing'. *ELT Journal*, 51: 326-35.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Essex: Longman.
- University of Nottingham. Official site. (nd). *Studying Effectively*. <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/studyingeffectively/teaching/seminars/preparing.aspx>
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wood, D. (2009). Effects of focused instruction of formulaic sequences on fluent expression in second language narratives: a case study. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12: 39-57.
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix 1

The following exercises are intended to provide an idea of some of the possible analyses short extracts from the videos lend themselves to, and were designed by the current paper author. They are taken out of the context of complete lessons, which would involve pre-lesson reading/viewing around the subject, much longer extracts of the videos and a variety of different activities designed around them, as proposed in the essay.

Exercise 1. Register, vague language, fillers, hesitations, false starts, and hedging.

Watch extracts 1a and b taken from the video *Beauty and "The Thin Red Line"*. Arts and Humanities. Film and television studies (see Appendix 2).

- a. What point does the speaker make in each case?
- b. What do you notice about the way the speakers express themselves?
- c. Why do you think they express themselves in this way?
- d. Read the transcript of the extract (Appendix 2, extract 1a and b) and underline all the expressions that you consider superfluous. Circle the content words.
- e. In pairs rephrase the students' opinions as concisely as possible.
- f. Discuss whether or not you consider your version an improvement and why.

Exercise 2. Subject-specific lexis and formulaic sequences

Watch the extract taken from the video *Gender and Globalisation*. Social Sciences. (Appendix 2)

- a. Summarise the points the students make.
- b. Watch again and draw up a list of the key vocabulary you hear.
- c. Read the transcript and underline the key vocabulary.
- d. Look at the transcript again, this time circling any groups of words that seem to naturally belong together e.g. *have a great effect on, in particular, in terms of, in the domestic sphere*
- e. Choose five of these chunks and write a gapped sentence for each one to test your classmates next lesson. You may use the concordance Sketch Engine to help you if you wish. For example:

Recent changes in the workforce are have had a g_ _ _ _ e_ _ _ _ o_ the economy.

Exercise 3. Turn-taking, adjacency pairs, discourse markers, response tokens

Watch the extract taken from the video *Gender and Globalisation*. Social Sciences. (Appendix 2)

- a. How does the seminar leader phrase her questions?
- b. How would you describe the atmosphere of the seminar? Does the discussion seem successful? Why/why not?
- c. How do the participants agree and disagree with each other?
- d. How do the participants start their interventions?
- e. Trace all examples of discourse markers e.g. *well, basically, right, now* and observe how they are used.

Appendix 2

Extracts taken from transcripts of seminars (BASE).

Extract 1a. *Beauty and "The Thin Red Line"* (Arts and Humanities. Film and television studies).

nm5019: mm what were you going to say Alan?

sm5028: i was just going to say that er however it appears to me that the v-, the depiction of the village is kind of the the this whole notion of beauty being disturbed is kind

CLENTON Jon

of how the film criticizes er war rather than you know doing a spie-, Spielberg and kind of you know saying war is bad it it shows war as having an effect on the the purity of the village er it disturbs the you know what was once serene is now you know it is it's all gone and i mean i wasn't so sure that er Witt had changed i thought that it was just the village had changed and he he's kind of making an observation about it i mean it it is filmed in er this kind of documentary s-, style like I mean i think a lot of it could come out of a nature movie

nm5019: yeah

sm5028: but it's it's through these kind of you know personal voiceovers and stuff where we get the er you know it kind of colour colours it in you know specific ways and it especially through Witt we get the you know what he really thinks

Extract 1b. *Beauty and "The Thin Red Line"* (Arts and Humanities. Film and television studies).

sm5029: and i know and i actually did er i was sort of uncomfortable with the start i thought this is a bit trite you know just swimming in the water and it's all very nice and you know so it and then you know the purity of the noble savage being corrupted by the modern world you know i was sort of i was thinking okay here we go but then when he did go back to the village I thought that was a key point because i thought it's sort of like Susan said that we would go and see a you know there they look like they're playing but they're fighting or whatever that bit is you know that's a key line i think

Extract 2. *Gender and Globalisation*. Social Sciences.

nf5395=seminar leader

nf5395: ok what are the effects of globalisation then in different areas of the world

sf5400: in the in the developing world it's it's had a great effect on women in particular because it means that their role as individual people has expanded er from the caretaker of their home er from domestic work from agricultural work into low pay employment so instead of just having the family and the fields to look after they now have the onus of jobs

sf5402: well one advantage that's been cited is that it does give women more independence

well er for instance just being just getting money for instance from these NGOs that operate there but that's the only advantage 'cause like you said then they they have their job but they all but it's having earning money doesn't mean that the job they're doing in the domestic domestic sphere like at home doesn't so it doesn't decrease at all and their role as i mean it's still a patriarchal family so her role doesn't increase either it doesn't so it's the idea of stretching her time stretching women's time

sf5396: we were also saying that that women's employment is still very insecure there's no kind of stability to it whatsoever er and that it would help if there was a a sort of reappropriation of roles within the domestic area but there isn't

sf5402: no there isn't yeah

sf5396: it's not women coming into the workforce a little bit and men starting to take some of the domestic responsibility

sf5402: the idea that the man is still the breadwinner still lingers on although she although the women are now earning as well

sf5396: so that the the exploitation is now rooted in in this idea that women's time and resources is endlessly expandable

sf5402: yeah infinite time yeah

nf5395: yeah what other effects what about this group what did you

sf5403: actually i was thinking about the first world women as well because you know now big companies have moved you know to use cheap labour in the in the third world countries right so women in the first world also lose their jobs at the same time so you know it doesn't mean that women in the first world will gain benefit from globalisation yeah because they have something to lose as well

nf5395: right and that's an example of that kind of change when it doesn't easily fit into the old theories er so that you're getting you know increasing pockets of poverty in rich countries and certain areas of growing er richness in so-called poor countries so yeah

sf5401: and i also feel that er globalisation has has has opened Africa the countries in Africa put gender on the agenda national agendas

nf5395: yeah yeah

sf5401: cause er from Namibia er in ninety-five when the country was made aware through globalisation of the Beijing conference and it is the first time in since Namibia's

CLENTON Jon

independence that it can really participate on gender issues nationally and after that five years after that Namibia started a gender ministry for the first time so i feel globalisation in a way forced African countries' men who were in authority to recognise that gender can also be discussed in this country and it obviously affects any woman's activities in the country from agricultural level to economic level and things so globalisation is then a positive thing but what happens after that now the ministry's established gender is on the agenda it's how it is going further on that is the question now

nf5395: that's that's a really interesting idea actually isn't it because it's kind of it's legitimising these certain kinds of issues which i'm sure have always been there er but have not been recognized