

Developing engineering students' presentation skills using a genre-based approach

ISSN 2657-9774; <https://doi.org/10.36534/erlj.2023.03.06>

Ivana Mirović*, Andrijana Berić**

*University of Novi Sad, Serbia; miriv@uns.ac.rs

** University of Novi Sad, Serbia; aberic@uns.ac.rs

Abstract

Good presentation skills are an essential part of engineering students' oral competence. LSP classroom presentations where students present topics of common interests to their classmates provide engineering students with an opportunity to socialize into the discourse of their future professional community. However, in a situation when the majority of students come to university with only limited knowledge about how to prepare an academic presentation, a foreign language presentation may become a daunting task. This paper aims to explore how some of the frequent hurdles encountered by engineering students when making presentations in LSP class can be overcome by using a genre-based approach. Identifying some of the common problems experienced by engineering students from the University of Novi Sad, the paper tries to relate them to the rhetorical and pragmatic skills required for making a successful presentation. It then focuses on identifying the moves and linguistic resources that characterize oral presentation as a genre before finally suggesting how this genre knowledge can be applied to making successful LSP presentations. Through this kind of practice, engineering students prepare to become effective participants in their future discourse communities.

Keywords: LSP, engineering students, oral presentations, genre-based instruction

Introduction

Presentation skills are an important component of engineering students' oral competence in a foreign or second language as these skills are required in their future professional life. Oral presentations delivered to a group of colleagues, members of the other team or potential clients are a frequent feature of the professional engineering environment and multinational teams, which communicate in an international language, are the reality of the 21st century. By providing practice in presenting topics of common interests to fellow students, LSP classroom presentations offer engineering students the opportunity to socialize into the discourse of their future professional community.

Oral presentations have become one of the principal genres in educational settings, from primary schools to higher education institutions (Zareva 2009, Zareva 2021, Hyland 2009, Kaur and Ali 2018). Presentations enable students to advance many of the key competencies required by contemporary education as they clearly align with modern teaching methodologies and educational goals (Knežević 2014). Sharing specific knowledge and information in the form of classroom presentations helps second language students in developing their communication skills. In addition, presentations help develop critical thinking, learner autonomy and digital skills and, at the same time, offer the benefit of practicing work in pairs and teams. However, presentation skills are rarely formally taught and presentations in a second or foreign language, although an important component in developing spoken language skills and evaluating students' oral competence, are not sufficiently represented in language learning pedagogy.

This paper examines the potential of using genre-based pedagogy to improve engineering students' presentation skills in an LSP (language for specific purpose) class at the university level. The notion of

genre has emerged in the past decades as one of the most important concepts in language research. At the same time, genre-based instruction or genre-based pedagogy has become an influential method in language teaching, particularly in teaching languages for specific purposes. Although past decades have provided evidence of the benefits of the genre-based approach, the research interest and, consequently, pedagogical applications have mainly been focused on written genres whereas oral genres have received considerably less attention. The present paper aims to provide insight into the LSP classroom presentation as an oral genre and to offer suggestions on how genre knowledge can be used to improve presentation skills. Based on the authors' experience in teaching English and German to engineering students from the University of Novi Sad, Serbia, it considers some of the common challenges engineering students encounter when making presentations in an LSP class and aims to propound ideas how these issues can be addressed based on the insights from the research into the generic characteristics of oral presentations in academic and professional settings.

Genre and genre-based instruction

Genre-based pedagogy has its roots in Swales' 1990 work, which established the basic concepts of applying genre theory to language teaching and greatly influenced ESP pedagogy. Swales (1990: 58) defines genre as "a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes" and stresses the role of the discourse community in which a genre is used. In his CARS model, he looks at the genre of research articles and describes RA introduction in terms of 'moves': basic units of discourse analysis that fulfil a communicative purpose and which are accompanied by 'sub-moves' or 'steps'. Genre analysis also examines text patterning and lexicogrammatical features of genres to identify how these are used by expert members of a discourse community. This approach has been employed to analyze various academic genres such as research abstracts (Salager-Mayer 1990), master theses and doctoral dissertations (Paltridge and Starfield 2007), student laboratory reports (Parkinson 2017), as well as non-academic genres such as letters of application (Henry and Roseberry 2001) and newspaper articles (Bonyadi 2012).

This interest in genre analysis has been reflected in language teaching, particularly in LSP (Flowerdew 2000, Swales, 2004). As part of genre-based pedagogy (GBP), academic and professional genres are analyzed and described with the idea that students' awareness of the target genre and how language is used to convey meaning in a particular context is instrumental for their future successful participation in this environment (Belcher 2009). As most genre studies have been focused on written genres, genre-based pedagogy in second language teaching has also been primarily oriented towards writing instruction. Application of GBP to teaching second language writing (Yasuda 2011, Wingate 2012, Wang 2013) indicates that the type of instruction that focuses on genre awareness and moves and steps of the genre results in improved writing quality and lexical intensity. The review of 11 studies on genre-based pedagogy (Budiwati 2021) stresses the great significance of genre knowledge in EFL classes for understanding genres as created, dynamic and ideological structures and for developing rhetorical flexibility for adapting this genre knowledge to achieve communicative goals. The positive effects of genre-based teaching are not limited to teaching writing and have been found to have an extended effect (Hyon 2001).

Genre analysis of spoken academic discourse has been undertaken less frequently and has mainly been focused on the so-called "high stake" genres such as academic lectures (e.g. Thompson 1994), dissertation defenses (Swales 2004), seminars (Weisberg 1993) and conference presentations (Dubois 1980, Carter-Thomas and Rowley-Jolivet 2003). Some of these studies will be analyzed in this paper as we believe they provide insights into the genre features, which are relevant for LSP student presentations and are valuable for engineering students' disciplinary socialization.

Challenges of LSP classroom presentations

Oral presentations are a salient feature of language learning classrooms. At a tertiary level, and specifically in LSP classes, students are expected to deliver informative, well-organized and effective presentations in a foreign language. Taking on the role of an expert in front of a group of colleagues and presenting a topic of common interest requires good presentation skills. However, adequate preparation in terms of understanding the specific features of oral presentation and acquiring linguistic resources for delivering a successful presentation is often missing. It is the authors' experience that even if students have had previous experience presenting in their first language, this does not always ensure the transfer of good presentations skills to LSP classrooms. The tradition of classroom presentation in the education system in Serbia puts more emphasis on information content and less on rhetorical and linguistic features of successful delivery.

Making a presentation is a demanding task, which is made additionally difficult in a situation of inadequate language proficiency (Weissberg 1993). For some students presenting in an LSP class becomes a daunting assignment, as it requires not only mastering a specific topic and subject matter but also acquiring specialized terminology, correct sentence structure and pronunciation of specific engineering terms. However, the problems related to LSP presentations are not solely related to language issues but very often stem from the lack of awareness of the characteristic features of oral presentations as a genre. In our experience, this is the reason why engineering students' presentations fail to incorporate appropriate linguistic features, which would convey relevant rhetorical functions of a presentation. The problems that students encounter when making presentations in English and German are very similar in this respect and for that reason, genre-based instruction can be effective in improving students' presentation skills.

Many of the problems related to LSP presentations stem from the fact that the source material for students' presentations is typically in written form (Wikipedia entry, web page, popular science article, online magazine article, etc.). In the situation when students are not sufficiently aware of the genre characteristics of oral presentations, they fail to successfully adapt these written genres to spoken discourse. For example, in the process of recontextualization of a written genre into an oral one, students need to perform some moves that characterize the genre of spoken presentations. They need to announce the topic of the presentation, its scope and organization as identified by Thompson, (1994). Additionally, they need to master the adequate linguistic resources to be used to achieve the desired communicative purpose, e.g. how to draw listeners' attention to the visual elements that accompany the presentation, how to indicate the closure of the presentation, etc.

The goal of this paper is to provide suggestions on how the challenges of making a presentation in an LSP class can be overcome by adopting a genre-based approach to teaching presentation skills in English and German. It tries to outline the rhetorical structure of oral presentation, which can be applied in teaching LSP classes, and to provide a description of linguistic features that expert English and German presenters typically use to achieve their communicative purpose. Based on the analysis of academic and professional oral presentations, we will provide a general framework of their structural organization that could be applied in LSP classrooms. In addition to the outline of the moves and steps involved in oral presentations we will try to identify the relevant lexico-grammatical features that would be useful for teaching presentation skills in English and German.

Methodology

Bhatia (1993) suggests that in order to make a comprehensive analysis of a genre one needs to consider the purpose of the analysis, the aspect of the genre one wishes to concentrate on and the background knowledge one already has about the genre. Depending on that, a researcher may employ some or all of the steps of his seven step model for carrying out the analysis of a genre: (1) Placing the

given genre-text in a situational context, (2) surveying existing literature, (3) Refining the situational / contextual analysis, (4) Selecting corpus, (5) Studying the institutional context, (6) Levels of linguistic analysis and (7) specialist information in genre analysis. However, a full-scope analysis of that type was not carried out within the present investigation. Instead of applying the seven steps of Bhatia's genre analysis model to the analysis of LSP students' presentations, the authors decided that for pedagogical purposes it would be more useful to focus on the related oral genres that student presentations actually try to emulate: primarily academic presentations and engineering presentations. The analysis of these presentations and the ways in which their communicative purpose is accomplished by the expert members of the discourse community can be useful in aiding students who can be regarded as novices in this field.

The rationale for this position is found in the fact that although classroom presentations can be approached as a specific genre, in the case of the LSP setting the ultimate aim of language instruction is to aid students' professionalization and prepare them for functioning in their future discourse community. Therefore, in our analysis of the research in this field, we focused on the parallels between LSP students' presentations and the 'experts' presentations that students try to recreate in the classroom. In an attempt to identify the genre features that are pedagogically utilizable in an LSP class, we focus on communicative purpose and situational context with the aim to characterize typical or conventional textual features of these genres.

Additionally, the approach adopted in this paper can be described in terms of interdiscursivity or generic repurposing. As suggested by Hu and Liu (2018) interdiscursivity is pervasive in the professional and academic worlds and can be observed in both written and spoken genres. The nature of genres is such that they can be transformed to respond to new communicative purposes and contexts by mixing generic features from different sources. Academic oral genres are not "pure" or "isolated" but draw on and repurpose generic resources from related genres. In that sense, LSP presentations can be viewed as a specific genre, which utilizes generic resources and rhetorical features of oral academic or professional genres. Therefore, we relied on the available research on expert's (professional engineers and university lecturers) presentations in identifying the linguistic features, moves and other generic characteristics that can be included in our instruction on students' oral presentations. Those characteristics are outlined below.

Characteristics of LSP presentations

Oral presentations are frequently defined as a monologic discourse that deals with information transfer. As a specific type of oral presentation, LSP presentations share some characteristics with academic lectures, conference presentations and PhD thesis defenses: they are well organized, delivered to live audiences and "subject to constraints of information processing in real time" (Hu and Liu, 2018: 18). The specific characteristic of LSP presentations in comparison to these oral genres lies in the context in which they occur (classroom setting which tries to recreate future professional or academic setting). The purpose of these genres is similar (to share knowledge of a particular topic of common interest) although the information load of LSP presentations is considerably smaller.

In addition to being informative, a presentation also needs to establish rapport with the audience as this interaction helps the presenter to convey a message successfully. Discussing communications skills in academic monologue discourse, Pérez-Llantada (2003) stresses the role of interactive skills in academic settings and states that "effective communication entails not only providing information in a clear and objective way but also producing a desired effect on the audience" (Pérez-Llantada 2003: 4).

An attribute of oral genres and LSP presentations, which students are not always aware of, is their ephemeral nature. Coming from a rhetorical background where the responsibility for understanding an oral or written text is usually on the listener/reader and not on the speaker/writer and faced with the

task of delivering complex messages in a foreign language, the students often focus on the engineering content and fail to establish rapport with the audience.. In this respect their presentations often lack language signposts which would engage and guide the audience and thus aid them in understanding the concepts which are being presented. On the other hand, Thompson's (1994) analysis of lecture introductions indicates that the successful transfer of knowledge in an oral presentation is facilitated by providing support for the listeners and presenting a clear lecture framework. In addition, the dissemination of information is not successful unless the presenter engages in paraphrasing, emphasizing and exemplifying with the aim of overcoming the fleeting character of spoken genres.

All presentations are multimodal, i.e. a presenter employs different semiotic resources or modes to communicate their ideas: language, tone, gestures, posture, visual aids, etc. Carter Thomas and Rowley-Jolivet (2003) note in their analysis that while the main channel of presentations at scientific conferences is the spoken one, a large number of visuals typically accompany a speaker's discourse. The present-day advances in new technologies increase the potential for using the affordances of different modes in classroom presentations. The use of slides with photographs, tables, graphs and different types of graphics as well as the use of audio or video can enhance the process of knowledge dissemination but this still needs to be accompanied by adequate linguistic support.

Interacting with the audience, organizing a presentation, structuring argumentation and many other aspects of an effective presentation are achieved by incorporating the linguistic features linked to the use of various forms of metadiscourse. In that respect, metadiscourse is a "central pragmatic construct" (Hyland 1998: 437) in academic communication as it explicitly organizes the discourse and engages the audience in order to achieve the desired communicative effect. Using metadiscourse in a way which is established in a given discourse community, provides a more effective knowledge transmission and for that reason adapting appropriate metadiscourse techniques is important for LSP students.

The rhetorical structure of LSP presentations can be studied by comparing them to academic lectures and conference presentations and specifically engineering presentations. As Kaur and Ali (2018) note there are not many studies that have examined the whole rhetorical structure of oral presentations (introduction, body, conclusion and questions and answers session). Most of the studies that focused on examining professional or academic presentations concentrate on only one segment, i.e. introduction. Thompson's (1994) analysis of 18 academic lecture introductions from various fields (including engineering) identified two rhetorical moves (which she calls functions): Setting up Lecture Framework and Putting Topic in Context as well as their seven sub-moves or sub-functions. Lee's (2016) analysis adds a Warming up move at the very beginning, which clearly reflects the particular context of this genre (classroom) and the roles of lecturers and students.

In their analysis of the structure of conference presentations, Carter-Thomas and Rowley-Jolivet (2003) start from the pioneering work in this field, the research of biomedical conference presentations by Dubois (1980) and the distinction between content orientation and listener orientation. Their rhetorical model for the scientific conference presentation introduction identifies three moves: A. Setting up the Framework, B. Contextualising the Topic, and C. Research rationale. Seliman's (1996) analysis of engineering oral presentations provides a framework, which includes Listener Orientation and Content Orientation in the presentation introduction. An overview of the moves and steps identified in these four studies is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Moves identified in lectures and oral presentations

MOVES	
Thompson (1994)	1. Setting up lecture framework - announce topic

lectures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - indicate scope - outline structure - present aims <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Putting topic in context <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - show importance/ relevance of topic - relate “new” to “given” - refer to earlier lectures
Seliman (1996) oral presentations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Orientating listeners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - thanking chairman - acknowledging audience - greeting audience - expressing appreciation 2. Orienting the content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - leading audience into content - announcing the title of OP - announcing subject and title of OP - commenting on subject/ title or subject and title of OP 3. Focusing on the content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - previewing the structure of OP briefly - previewing the structure of OP in detail - limiting the scope of coverage of the work
Carter-Thomas and Rowley-Jolivet (2003) conference presentations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Setting up the framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interpersonal framework (listener orientation and/ or acknowledgments) - discourse framework (announce topic and outline structure/ indicate scope) 2. Contextualizing the topic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conference context - general research context 3. Research rationale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - motivation - response - outline research goals
Lee (2016) classroom lessons	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Warming up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - making a digression - housekeeping - looking ahead 2. Setting up the lecture framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - announcing the topic - indicating the scope - outlining the structure - presenting the aims 3. Putting the topic in context <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - showing the importance of the topic - relating “new” to “given” - referring to earlier lecture(s)

As the overview of the abovementioned studies shows, the rhetorical phases in the introduction include the steps which are aimed at providing some kind of cognitive road map for the audience, e.g., outlining the structure, scope or organization of the presentation, previewing or contextualizing the topic, etc. This is intended to help the listeners follow the presentation/lecture. Additionally, the common step in the analysis of conference presentations, which is not present in the analysis of university lectures, is the interpersonal step where the presenter directly addresses the chairman/audience. The authors of all of these studies emphasize that the moves and steps are identified based on their high incidence of occurrence but were not necessarily employed by all the speakers. Some of the steps are described as optional and the steps do not always follow the same sequence. It is important that these generic variations be indicated to the students so that they are aware of the flexible nature of these spoken genres and understand genre as a way of achieving rhetorical goals rather than as a static set of rules and conventions.

The flexible nature of LSP presentations becomes even more prominent if we attempt to analyze the body of the presentations. The study by Seliman (1996) which analyzed the entire structure of engineering presentations provides a detailed analysis of this genre. However, it should be noted that it deals specifically with the presentations with the problem/solution pattern. Hu and Liu (2018) who studied a new genre of Three Minute Thesis (3MT) presentations identified eight moves in this new genre: Orientation, Rationale, Framework, Purpose, Method, Results and Termination. This structure reflects the competitive nature of these presentations as well as the fact that they are based on students' PH theses. Neither this nor Seliman's (1996) study can serve as a model for LSP students. In an LSP class, the task that students are given is usually defined very vaguely ("present an engineering topic of common interest for the group"). Consequently, their presentations can have very different formats: a historical overview, a short analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of a particular solution, a classification with examples, an explanation of the operation principles of a system /piece of equipment, etc. The structural organization of the text, its steps and moves then vary accordingly. As Kaur and Ali (2018) notice, the moves in the body of a presentation reflect the task they set out to achieve and thus this part of an oral presentation cannot be described in terms of standard rhetorical moves.

The concluding section of the presentation described in Seliman's (1996) study includes Preclosing and Closing moves. Pérez Llantada (2003) notes, based on personal experience that the established rhetorical moves of an academic presentation would include: summarizing main points, relating conclusion to them, making recommendations or proposals, inviting questions and thanking the audience. Some of these have their place in LSP presentations as standard features of spoken genres.

The linguistic features of LSP presentations correspond to their communicative purpose and rhetorical structure, as is the case with academic and professional presentations. The illustrations providing examples of the linguistic realization of these communicative purposes will be given here in English and German. The introduction reflects the need to establish an interpersonal and discourse framework by directly addressing and greeting the audience and providing an overview of the presentation (e.g. *I'm going to address the problem of ...*, *Ich werde folgendes Problem ansprechen...*). As Thompson (1994) analysis of academic lectures indicates, these functions include linguistic features which indicate sequence (*firstly, then ...*; *zuerst, dann...*) temporal relationship between presentation segments (*before, later...*; *bevor, nachher...*) or the scope of the presentation (*briefly, broad...*; *kurz gesagt, allgemein...*).

The body of the presentation, as was mentioned earlier, does not follow a set sequence of moves. However, there are certain linguistic features which can be expected to appear in this section of the presentation for the purpose of indicating a new segment of the presentation (e.g. *Let's move on to ...*; *Nun zu...*), emphasizing similarity or contrast (e.g. *similarly...*, *unlike ...*, *by contrast...*; *ähnlich...*, *im Gegensatz zu...*, *im Unterschied zu...*), making classifications (e.g. *These can be divided into three groups*

...; *Das lässt sich in drei Gruppen einteilen...*), etc. For this reason, the main part of the presentation incorporates various metadiscourse features which students need to master regardless of the specific communicative purpose and structure of a particular presentation.

Throughout the presentation, the interactive character of the genre is reflected through the use of language for addressing the audience and establishing a positive rapport. This is usually achieved through the use of pronouns for addressing the audience (*you; man*) or including the audience (*we; Sie*). Other metadiscourse techniques also explicitly provide different types of signals for the audience: they indicate an example (e.g. *Let me illustrate this ...; Lassen Sie mich das erläutern...*), introduce an idea (e.g. *What I'm going to do is...; Was ich machen werde, ist folgendes...*) or suggest a connection (e.g. *This leads me to...; Das führt mich zu...*). The interpersonal nature of the presentation is also indicated by reformulating and paraphrasing what has been said in order to make sure the communication is successful (e.g. *Let me explain it in a different way ..., In other words...; Lassen Sie es mich anders erklären..., Mit anderen Worten...*).

The multimodal character of a presentation is reflected in the lexical features, which explicitly indicate the use of other modes, usually visual (e.g. *As you can see in this graph..., This picture shows...; Wie Sie sehen können..., Dieses Bild zeigt...*) in order to fully exploit their affordances.

The conclusion of the presentation would usually include the language that suggests that the presentation is coming to a close by referring to time constraints (e.g. *In the last few minutes ...; Am Ende...*), providing a summary of the main points (e.g. *To summarize ...; Zum Schluß möchte/ soll man unterstreichen...*), indicating topics of future research (e.g. *It would be interesting to further investigate...; Es wäre interessant, weiter zu recherchieren...*) before thanking the audience and inviting questions.

Implementation in LSP classrooms

After analyzing the research on oral presentations which focused on the members of the relevant discourse communities (academics and engineering professionals) and identifying the characteristics that are important for LSP classroom presentations, we can summarize their most prominent generic features. An overview of the moves and steps (where identified) as well as the lexico-grammatical and metadiscourse features which can be expected to be incorporated in LSP classroom presentations are given in Table 2. As it has been frequently argued, genre characteristics should not be treated as fixed patterns, which should be rigidly followed, and therefore the overview presented in this table is not intended to be prescriptive or exhaustive.

Table 2. LSP presentation moves and their lexical realization in English and German

INTRODUCTION	
move 1 – interpersonal framework	
-	step 1 – greeting audience
a)	<i>Hello everyone, my name is...// Good morning/ Good afternoon everyone...</i>
b)	<i>Hallo, mein Name ist...// Guten Morgen/ Guten Tag...</i>
-	step 2 – announcing topic
a)	<i>As you can see on the screen, my topic for today is ...// Today I will be talking about...</i>
b)	<i>Wie Sie auf dem Bildschirm sehen können, lautet unser heutiges Thema...// Ich möchte heute über das Thema.. sprechen</i>
move 2 – discourse framework	
-	step 1 – outline presentation structure
a)	<i>I will start by .., then I will.. and finally we will...// First ... , second ...</i>
b)	<i>Am Anfang werde ich über.. sprechen, dann werde ich..danach wird.. zum Schluß</i>

<p><i>wird...//</i> <i>Bevor ich über (..) spreche..</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - step 2 – providing context <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>You probably know thatThis topic is interesting because ... // Let us remember...</i> b) <i>Dieses Thema haben wir bereits behandelt...// Erinnern wir uns an...</i>
BODY
various formats and moves but will probably include :
<p>Classification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>We can divide this into two parts...</i> b) <i>Man kann das/ Wir können das in zwei Teile aufteilen...</i> <p>Moving from one segment to another</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Now I'd like to turn to...// Having considered (x), let us now move on to (y)..</i> b) <i>Jetzt würde ich...// In diesem Zusammenhang können wir noch...erwähnen...</i> <p>Focusing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>I'd like to focus on...// What I'm going to do is to explain...</i> b) <i>Ich erläutere dieses Thema...// Diese Tabelle zeigt uns..</i> <p>Comparing and contrasting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Similarly ...On the other hand...// However...</i> b) <i>Einerseits...andererseits...// Jedoch...</i> <p>Giving an example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>For instance...// In other words...</i> b) <i>Zum Beispiel...// Mit anderen Worten...</i>
CONCLUSION
move 1 – preclosing
<p>step 1 – summarizing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>To sum up ...// I'd like to finish by saying...</i> b) <i>Zum Schluß möchte/ soll man unterstreichen...</i> <p>step 2 – indicating future directions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>In the future....</i> b) <i>Wie wird es weitergehen</i>
move 2 - closing
<p>step 1- thanking audience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Thank you for your attention</i> b) <i>Vielen Dank für Ihre Aufmerksamkeit</i> <p>step 2 – inviting questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>If there are any questions...</i> b) <i>Wenn es irgendwelche Fragen gibt...</i>

Table 2 summarizes the main features which can be found in the introduction of LSP classroom presentations by indicating the interpersonal (audience-oriented) and discourse (presentation-oriented) elements in its framework. As the rhetorical structure of the body of the presentation is varied and depends on the specific task and communicative purpose, the moves and steps of this part of LSP presentations cannot be identified. However, this section of the presentation is expected to include functions like classification, organization of a segment, comparison or exemplification which are prominent in oral presentations. The linguistic and metalinguistic elements for realizing these generic features need to be taught in the classroom as students need to acquire a wide range of expressions

that can be used to achieve these functions. For reasons of practicality, only a few of them could be included in Table 2. The concluding section of LSP presentations is presented in two moves (Preclosing move and Closing) in order to emphasize the role of the preclosing move. Our students frequently fail to deploy this move and finish the presentation abruptly by thanking the audience. The summarization step is particularly important as it provides the opportunity to accentuate and relate the main points of the presentation.

The process of implementing GBP in teaching oral presentations that we use in our practice is loosely based on the learning cycle proposed by Hammond et al. (1992: 1) building knowledge of the field; 2) modelling of the text; 3) joint construction of the text; 4) independent construction of the text. Our classroom practice starts with building knowledge of the genre: this may take the form of a classroom discussion about the context in which presentations occur and the students' experience with presenting or listening to presentations. The second stage is the modelling stage where a teacher may provide a model (or several models) of a good presentation to be later analyzed in terms of its structure and linguistic features. At this point, the moves and steps can be identified through various exercises and the lexico-grammatical features of the presentations are highlighted, illustrated and practiced. As part of this second stage students are encouraged to provide variations of the ways in which certain moves and steps can be realized as they are constantly reminded of the flexible nature of the genre. The original four-stage model (Hammond et al., 1992) is in our classroom practice reduced to three stages as the last stage is independent construction of the text, i.e. presentation (which can be accomplished individually or in pairs).

Conclusion

Presentation skills play an important role in engineering students' future professional environment and LSP classroom presentations provide an opportunity to equip students with the knowledge that will help them to successfully function in their chosen profession. This paper analyzed the research on the rhetorical and linguistic features of expert presentations with the aim of gaining knowledge which can help novice presenters acquire the necessary skills. This analysis has shown that the steps and moves in the introductory and conclusion sections can be identified as they have a clear rhetorical structure whereas the structure of the body of the presentation can show great variation depending on the context and communicative purpose. Future research attention may therefore focus on analyzing this segment of oral presentations.

The linguistic features of presentations have been found to include various lexical resources, which can have interactive purposes, provide discourse framework, establish relationships between presentation segments and generally structure effective argumentation. The use of metadiscourse markers is instrumental here for managing the information flow and helping the audience follow the presented material.

During genre-based classroom instruction students acquire a conscious understanding of how meaning is created in the context of oral presentation and become aware of the linguistic features which can help them to realize their communicative purpose. This generic knowledge can help them in their professionalization, i.e. ensure the necessary level of presentation skills that will enable them to successfully function in their future discourse community.

Acknowledgments

The authors of the paper thank the Department of Fundamental Disciplines, Faculty of Technical Sciences for the support within the project *Application of Fundamental Disciplines in Technical and Information Sciences*.

References

- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman.
- Bonyadi, A. (2012). Genre Analysis of Media Texts. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 86-96.
- Budiwati, T.R. (2021). A Descriptive Review of Genre-Based Pedagogy Studies (Towards Genre Awareness in EFL Context of Indonesia). *Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies*, 8, 59-67.
- Carter-Thomas, S., Rowley-Jolivet, E. (2003). Analyzing the scientific conference presentation (CP), A methodological overview of a multimodal genre. *ASp*, 39-40.
- Dubois, B. L. (1980). Genre and structure of biomedical speeches. *Forum Linguisticum*, 5, 140-168.
- Flowerdew, L. (2000). Using a genre-based framework to teach organizational structure in academic writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(4), 369-378.
- Hammond, J., Burns, A., Joyce, H., Brosnan, D., Gerot, L., Solomon, N., Hood, S. (1992). English for social purposes: A handbook for teachers of adult literacy. *National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research*, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia.
- Henry, A., Roseberry, R.L. (2001). A Narrow-Angled Corpus Analysis of Moves and Strategies of the Genre: "Letter of Application." *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(2), 153-167.
- Hu, G., Liu, Y. (2018). Three minutes thesis presentations as an academic genre: A cross-disciplinary study of genre moves. *Journal of English for Academic Purpose*, 35, 16-30.
- Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: the pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30, 437-455.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Hyon, S (2001). Long-term effects of genre-based instruction: a follow-up study of an EAP reading course. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 417-438. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(01\)00019-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(01)00019-9)
- Kaur, K., Ali A. M. (2018). Exploring the Genre of Academic Oral Presentations: A Critical Review. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7, 152-162.
- Knežević, L. (2014). The development of oral presentation skill in the department of foreign languages. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 63(1), 107-119.
- Lee, J. J. (2016). "There's intentionality behind it...": A Genre Analysis of EAP Classroom Lessons. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 99-112.
- Paltridge, B., Starfield, S. (2007). *Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language: A handbook for supervisors*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Parkinson, R. (2017). The student laboratory report genre: A genre analysis. *English for Specific Purposes*, 45, 1-13.
- Pérez-Llantada, C. (2003). Communication Skills in Academic Monologue Discourse. Empirical and Applied Perspectives. *Círculo de lingüística aplicada a la comunicación*, 15
- Salager-Mayer, F. (1990) Discoursal flaws in medical English abstracts: A genre analysis per research and text-type. *Text*, 4, 365-384.
- Seliman, S. (1996). *The genre and the genre expectations of engineering oral presentations related to academic and professional context*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Stirling.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press
- Thompson, S. (1994). Frameworks and contexts: A genre-based approach to analysing lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(2), 171-186.

- Wang, C. (2013). A study of genre approach in EFL writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(11), 2128-2135. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.11.2128-2135>
- Weissberg, B. (1993). The graduate seminar: Another research-process genre. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12(1), 23-35.
- Wingate, U. (2012) Using academic literacies and genre-based models for academic writing instruction: A “literacy” journey. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(1), 26-37.
- Yasuda, S. (2011). Genre-based tasks in foreign language writing: Developing writers' genre awareness, linguistic knowledge, and writing competence. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(2), 111-133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.03.001>
- Zareva, A. (2009). Lexical Composition of Effective L1 and L2 Students' Academic Presentations. *English Faculty Publications*, 51. https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_fac_pubs/51
- Zareva, A. (2021). Oral Academic Genres and Features of Student Academic Presentations. In H. Mohebbi, C. Coombe, (Eds.) *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 487 – 492). Cham. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8_86