

Using Genre to Evaluate Spoken English

Damian Lucantonio
University of Electro-Communications

Eric Hauser
University of Electro-Communications and
University of Hawai'i at
Mānoa

Reference Data:

Lucantonio, D., & Hauser, E. (2015). Using genre to evaluate spoken English. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *JALT2014 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

This paper reports on a practice-oriented workshop. The concept of genre from systemic functional linguistics is described, followed by a more specific description of a particular genre: procedure. The teaching and testing of the genre of procedure in a required 1st-year university genre-based English class, called Academic Spoken English, is described, followed by a description of the evaluation criteria used to evaluate the students' procedures. In the workshop at the JALT2014 Conference, participants used these evaluation criteria to rate the video-recorded spoken procedures of two students. These procedures are presented in this paper in the form of transcripts, and the reasons for participants' ratings are explained. It is argued that the concept of genre provides a solid basis for evaluating spoken (and written) texts.

本論考はまずジャンルという機能言語学の概念を説明し、ジャンルの具体的な例としてプロシージャを説明する。次に大学一年生の英語必修科目 (Academic Spoken English) でのプロシージャの教え方とテスト方法を説明し、そのテストの評価基準を説明する。JALT2014の大会のワークショップで、参加者はその評価基準を使って、ビデオ録画された二人の学生の会話でのプロシージャを評価した。二つのプロシージャは本論文にトランスクリプトとして掲載し、ワークショップ参加者の評価について説明する。ジャンルという概念が口頭及び書かれたテキストを評価するための確固とした基板になると論じる。

THIS PAPER reports on a workshop at the JALT2014 Conference that focused on the use of evaluation criteria, based on systemic functional linguistics (SFL), to rate video-recorded instances of spoken procedure, that is, a set of steps for accomplishing a predetermined goal or outcome. The procedures were produced in English by Japanese university students in an oral examination for a genre-based class on spoken academic English.

When evaluating students' spoken texts, teachers may focus on various features of their performance, such as pronunciation, fluency, or even eye contact with the audience. However, given that English is an international language extensively used by people who do not use it as a first language, as well as that there are a variety of norms for pronunciation even within standard varieties, it becomes difficult to justify a focus on pronunciation as the basis of evaluation. Fluency may be an important element of spoken language, but it is generally operationalized as a lack of hesitation and repetition. This may be problematic in that there are often good interactional reasons for such things as hesitation and repetition, as shown in much conversation analytic research (e.g., Jefferson, 1974). Finally, a focus on such things as eye contact may be useful for evaluating presentation skills but moves away from evaluating language. With its focus on how texts are constructed, SFL, and



specifically that part of SFL known as genre theory, can provide a basis for evaluating spoken texts that avoids such problems (Paltridge, 2001).

We describe the concept of genre as it has been developed within SFL. This is followed by a description of the specific genre of procedure. Next, we describe how the genre of academic procedure was taught, how it was tested, and the type of procedure that the students produced. The purpose of this description is to provide context for understanding the procedures that the students produced. The information in this description was also part of the workshop. This is followed by a description of the criteria that workshop participants used to evaluate the procedures. We then present transcripts of the two procedures that workshop participants evaluated, along with the ratings and explanations for the ratings given by the participants. Finally, we argue that genre provides a solid basis for the evaluation of spoken texts and discuss feedback from participants.

Genre in Spoken and Written English

For the purposes of this paper, the approach taken to evaluate spoken English is underpinned by the SFL theory of language (Halliday, 1985; Halliday & Hasan, 1985), focusing on the concept of genre. The work of Martin (1985) in developing a theory of genre within the theoretical framework of SFL is considered to be of particular importance, as the term *genre* refers to both spoken and written language. Genres describe text types and how different types of texts are organized in different ways to achieve different social purposes. It is argued that if students for whom English is a foreign language are unfamiliar with the sociocultural norms of the genre, then the norms need to be made explicit through the teaching and testing approach (Gibbons, 2002; Lucantonio, 2009).

Drawing on the work of Halliday and Hasan (1985) in SFL register theory, Martin (1985) developed a definition of genre as a staged,

goal-oriented, social process. The term *staged* refers to the steps the text moves through to achieve its goal. Martin refers to these steps as the generic structure of a text. In educational contexts, it is not necessary to use technical or metalanguage. Hence, teachers often refer to a text's generic structure as simply the patterning of a text (Lucantonio, 2009). The term *goal-oriented* refers to the purpose of the text. According to Martin and Rose (2003), texts typically move through certain stages to achieve a goal or to reach a conclusion. How the information in a text is patterned or organized reflects its social purpose. The term *social process* represents what goes on in society. It is social because we participate in genres with other people (Martin & Rose, 2003) and it describes the process of how meanings are created and exchanged in society. Genres, then, are not a static collection of structures and formulas. According to Eggins and Slade (1997), they are negotiated interactively in society according to sociocultural norms that have been institutionalized over time and therefore represent an important social process.

Genres are comprised of both obligatory and optional elements (Eggins & Slade, 1997; Halliday & Hasan, 1985). The obligatory elements are those that are recognized as the defining features of the genre. If obligatory elements are missing, or not in the expected order, the text will appear to be incomplete. Optional elements are those that are not necessarily defining features. They can be omitted or added depending on the speaker or writer. In a genre-based approach to teaching or testing, it is therefore important to make explicit which elements are compulsory and which are optional, as well as the order in which they occur.

The Genre of Procedure

The social function of a procedure genre is to describe how something is accomplished through a sequence of actions or steps (Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Project, 1989). For the purposes of this paper, this genre is regarded as an important interdisciplinary activity for a wide range of university students, not just for those in-

involved in academic English courses or for those in English for science and engineering courses. It is also considered an important real world activity requiring everyday language use. According to Derewianka (1990), it is an important genre in our society because it explains the step-by-step process of how things are accomplished and is common in both spoken and written modes of language use.

Typically, the obligatory elements of a procedure are the goal followed by a series of steps oriented to achieving the goal (Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Project, 1989). The goal refers to the purpose of what is to be achieved and is often indicated in the main heading or diagram in a written text or by the title at the beginning of a spoken text (Derewianka, 1990). These refer to *what* things, both human and nonhuman, are required to achieve the goal. The steps refer to the method of *how* the goal is to be achieved and usually occur in a fixed order. Each stage serves a particular function of what we need to do next in order to achieve the goal (Derewianka, 1990). The steps of simple procedures are usually all compulsory; however, in more complex procedures, some additional steps or substeps may be added that are considered to be optional.

Procedures contain certain specific language features that are typical of this genre in English. These issues have been included in the language performance descriptions at various levels in the rating scale. The use of present tense, in particular the use of imperatives, is a common feature. In procedures, material or action verbs are commonly used and are often expressed as commands in the imperative voice (Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Project, 1989). This is a common grammatical feature of instructional or directional texts. The present tense reflects all inclusive time that tends not to change over periods of time, whether it be in the past, present, or future. It is considered timeless and is common when expressing facts in scientific English (Lucantonio, 2014) or in a general, everyday process. Action verbs in the imperative voice often occur towards the initial position of the sentence or utterance, focusing on what needs to be done to achieve the goal.

Temporal and sequential conjunctions indicating the order in which things need to be done are also a feature of procedures (Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Project, 1989). These include words such as *first*, *next*, *after that*, *then*, and *finally*. Furthermore, procedures tend to focus on generalized human participants (Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Project, 1989) and what all people need to do, rather than individual participants. Hence, there is often an absence of personalized reference. Personal pronouns, such as *I*, *me*, *we*, and so on, are often not required in procedures, as the focus tends to be on the steps of the procedure, rather than the person or *who* is involved (Derewianka, 1990).

Describing how something works or how something is done is important for science and engineering students. However, procedure is also a common and useful genre for everyday life (Derewianka, 1990). Understanding and producing a variety of procedures that commonly occur in everyday social activities is an important skill for learners to acquire. Hence, evaluating how well students can perform these procedures is regarded as important in the language-learning classroom.

Teaching and Testing Procedures for Constructing Geometric Figures

The spoken procedures that workshop participants evaluated were produced by two 1st-year students at a Japanese university that specializes in engineering and applied science. The students were members of a required spoken English class, taught by the second author, with a genre-based curriculum that included procedure. It is reasonable to assume that the students had little or no prior knowledge of the sociocultural norms involved in various genres of academic English, including procedure, prior to entering university. In order to draw on students' strength in mathematics, the procedure for constructing a geometric figure using a compass and straightedge, as shown by Birkhoff and Beatley (cited in Livingston, 2008) was used for both teaching and testing. Although the focus

of the workshop was on evaluating spoken procedures, in order to provide context for the students' spoken texts, the teaching and testing method described below was also described to the workshop participants.

In class, the instructor pretaught vocabulary related to geometry and then twice modeled a procedure for constructing a perpendicular bisector of a line segment. Using a digital overhead camera and projector, he also constructed this figure while modeling the procedure. While modeling it the second time, he wrote the goal and each step on the board after saying it. He used this written record to draw attention to and explicitly teach the generic organization of a procedure and the use of the imperative in a procedure. Next, students (who had been instructed to bring a compass and a straightedge to class) worked in groups of two or three to come up with a procedure for the construction of a bisector of an angle. The instructor then wrote the goal of the procedure (*This is how to construct a bisector of an angle*) on the board and elicited the steps from the class. After each step was elicited, it was written on the board and the instructor followed it with his own compass and straightedge.

The following week, the instructor once more modeled the procedure for constructing a perpendicular bisector of a line segment, as well as the procedure for constructing a bisector of an angle. He then showed the students a diagram that visually displayed the construction of a regular pentagon. Once again, the students worked in groups of two or three to come up with a procedure for constructing this figure, which the instructor elicited from the class, wrote on the board, and followed. Finally, the students were given an assignment for independent construction of a spoken procedure. They were told to make notes for a procedure for constructing a geometric figure, which could be a regular pentagon but not a bisector of either a line segment or an angle. In giving the assignment, the instructor once more reminded the students that a procedure is organized as a goal followed by steps.

At their assigned time, students came to the instructor's office to perform the procedure as an examination, with the instructor attempting to follow the procedure. They mostly came in groups of two, but each student produced his or her own procedure. Most students took between 2 minutes and 5 minutes to complete the procedure. They were told to use their notes to help them remember what to say, but not to simply read their notes. Each procedure was video recorded to be evaluated later. On the last day of class, students were asked for written permission to use the recordings for research. Two of these recordings were used for the workshop.

Evaluation Criteria

The criteria used for the evaluation instrument in the workshop were based on an adapted version of the rating scale for speaking in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). The instrument is divided into three main sections: the ratings, the descriptions, and the details. The adapted version is different from the IELTS scale in that (a) it is more holistic and, therefore, somewhat easier to use and (b) it is focused on a particular genre.

The rating scale (see Appendix) consists of six bands in the first column (*Rating*), from 0 (described as a “non-user” of spoken English) through to 5 (described as an “excellent user”). Descriptions of student performance are provided for each of the bands under *Details*, using functional labels that illustrate in broad terms what the speakers can do and how well they can do it. The descriptions integrate issues relating to genre theory, such as the obligatory elements of the genre of procedure and appropriate language choices. The appropriate use of language refers to how language varies according to the different contexts in which it is used (Halliday, 1985; Halliday & Hasan, 1985), a key issue in SFL register theory. The organization of the text refers to how texts are organized in different ways to achieve different social purposes (Martin, 1985; Martin & Rose, 2003), which is a key element in SFL genre theory. In the third column, *Details* are provided to further describe and elaborate on what

the speakers can do and how well they can do it; these have been specifically adapted for a procedure genre. The details are designed to help raters fine-tune their overall ratings, in order to gain greater accuracy and reliability when evaluating spoken procedures.

Evaluation of Two Spoken Procedures

In the workshop, the six participants (including the authors) viewed two recorded spoken procedures. Each participant was a practicing language teacher. After each procedure, they took a few minutes to independently rate it. This was followed by discussion of the ratings with reference to the rating scale, first in two groups, each led by one of the authors, and then among all workshop participants. The procedures are presented below in the form of transcripts designed to draw attention to the patterning of the spoken text and certain language choices. It should be noted that transcripts are used here only to present the data in a written format and were not used in the workshop. Rather, the participants rated the students' performances as they were captured in the video recordings.

Following each transcript is the range of ratings for this procedure and a brief description of the basis for this range. The ratings of the participants were within a reliability range of one, which is considered to be an acceptable measure of reliability. Throughout the workshop, the participants were encouraged to match student performance to the evaluation criteria, rather than compare the performance of one student to another. Also, it was stressed that the criteria for evaluating pronunciation should be viewed in terms of being mutually intelligible and socially acceptable and therefore not necessarily marked down if the students spoke with a marked accent, unless it adversely affected these criteria. Furthermore, participants were encouraged to focus on what the students can do, rather than what they cannot do, when evaluating spoken performance. Focusing on these three issues seemed to contribute to the overall reliability of the ratings by the participants.

In the transcripts, the instructor is referenced as T and the student as S1 or S2. Silences of at least a half second are noted in parentheses, measured to the closest half second. Shorter but noticeable silences are noted by three dots (...). Punctuation is used to note intonation, with a period noting falling intonation, a comma fall-rising intonation, and a question mark rising intonation. Japanese words are in itali^cs. Nonverbal features such as eye gaze and gesture are not noted in these transcripts. There are several relatively long silences during which the teacher is drawing.

Sample 1 (Approximately 1 minute, 40 seconds)

- GOAL: S1: ehh (1.5) my goal is regular triangle.
(pretaught vocabulary for geometry)
- T: okay,
(1)
- STEP S1: eh first ... (vocabulary to indicate order)
- T: mhm,
S1: uht (1) try *ano* draw line segment.
(imperative; pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- T: draw a line segment. okay.
(3.5)
- STEP S1: m. second names both line (0.5) ends.
(order vocabulary; imperative with slight error)
- T: mhm,
S1: A an' B.
T: okay.
(2.5)
- STEP S1: put compass (0.5) at ... needle on A. (imperative)
- T: okay,
(1.5)
- S1: draw cycle of the ... radius of the length of
A to B. (imperative; pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- T: okay.
(7)

T: okay?

STEP S1: kh put needle on B, (imperative)

T: mhm,
(2.5)

S1: and (0.5) draw cycle ... uh radius of length
A to B. (imperative; pretaught geometry vocabulary)

T: okay.
(4.5)

T: okay?

STEP S1: yeah. and names two ... intersection of two
cycles C and D (imperative with slight error; pretaught
geometry vocabulary)

T: okay.
(2)

STEP S1: and (1) you (1) use uh (3.5) *jooge* stray
strage (imperative)

T: straightedge?

S1: strader. yes.

T: mhm,

S1: anm A to C (1.5) line.

T: from A to C. okay.

S1: yeah.
(1)

STEP S1: and B to C.

T: okay,
(4)

S1: yeah.

T: okay good. okay can I have your notes?
(2)

T: so you don't really need D do you. okay (laugh-
ter)

S1: yeah (laughter)

The goal of this procedure is clearly stated at the beginning, with this being followed by a series of steps. Each of the steps is clear

and the teacher has no difficulty following them. Language use is mostly appropriate, with the student using the imperative throughout, though occasionally with a slight error, except for the second part of the second-to-last step, where something such as *draw a line* would have been more appropriate than just “line.” She makes some use of order vocabulary at the start, but does not continue to use it throughout. She makes good use of vocabulary related to geometry, which was taught in class. There are some problems with pronunciation, most notably pronouncing *circle* as *cycle*, but this does not lead to difficulties with following the procedure and pronunciation is not included in the evaluation criteria. Workshop participants rated this student's procedure as a 3 or 4, with a strong feeling that there was a need for the possibility of giving a rating of 3.5.

Sample 2 (Approximately 5 minutes, 15 seconds)

GOAL S2: yeah. (1) let's start. (0.5) eh this is how
you consist a (0.5) octagon. (pretaught geometry
vocabulary)

T: mhm,

STEP S2: okay. eh first. ... draw a (0.5) circle.
(imperative; order vocabulary; pretaught geometry vocabulary)

T: okay,
(5.5)

STEP S2: second. label the point of compass (0.5) O.
(imperative; order vocabulary)

T: okay, center point? okay.
(3)

STEP S2: eh third. (0.5) draw a ... eh *deeup* diameter.
(imperative; order vocabulary; pretaught geometry vocabulary)

T: mhm,

S2: through O.

T: okay,
(5.5)

STEP S2: fourth. eh (3) label the point of ... inter

- section A and B. (imperative; order vocabulary; pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- T: A and B. okay,
(2.5)
- STEP S2: fifth ... place the point of (1) a compass. ... on A. (imperative; order vocabulary)
- T: A. okay.
...
- S2: and draw ... arc. (imperative; pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- (2)
- T: the same size?
(2)
- S2: ih mo more smooath.
T: hm?
S2: more big.
T: what bigger?
S2: more more longside.
T: like this?
(1)
- S2: yes.
T: okay.
(3)
- STEP S2: eh next. eh (1) place (1) eh place the point of compass on B. (imperative; order vocabulary)
- T: mhm,
S2: and draw the (2) arc. (imperative; pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- (3)
- T: okay,
- STEP S2: eh. eh next ... eh ... make uh draw an deeuhtmet diameter. (imperative; order vocabulary; pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- (1)
- S2: uh (0.5) point of ... section. uh
- intersection. (pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- (2)
- T: so ... the intersection of the two arcs?
- S2: yes.
T: so draw a line segment?
S2: line segment. (pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- T: okay,
(4)
- S2: uh m mo more long.
(0.5)
- T: oh
S2: uh
T: longer? okay.
S2: yes ... uh ... s circle ... cross the circle. ... yes. (pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- T: like this oh okay okay okay.
(1.5)
- STEP S2: the intersection of eh ... circle of (0.5) this line. (1) eh (0.5) s ... uh label ... the intersection of (1) dih this line and circle eh ... C and D. (imperative; pretaught geometry vocabulary)
- T: C and D. okay.
(2.5)
- STEP S2: eh next eh (2) eh place ... eh ... the ... point of (1) compass, (0.5) on A. (imperative; order vocabulary)
- T: on A. okay,
S2: and shorter (3.5) shorter (unintelligible). arc.
T: okay shorter shorter than A O?
(1)
- S2: A O. shorter than A O.
T: okay like this?
(5)

- STEP S2: yeah. (1) repeat ... on ... C. (imperative)
(0.5)
T: repeat on C. okay.
(7.5)
- STEP S2: uh make ... the (0.5) eh diameter of circle
euh (1) intersection ... of ... arc. and ...
through O. (imperative; pretaught geometry vocabulary)
...
T: through O. oh okay, like here,
(0.5)
S2: uhm not. euh two two uh two arcs
intersection. (pretaught geometry vocabulary)
...
T: oh okay (1) so (1) one is here
S2: yes.
(4)
T: like this?
(1.5)
S2: and other side.
(0.5)
T: okay. then the other side. here.
(3)
S2: yes.
T: like that. okay.
(1)
- STEP S2: eh label the ... intersection of points as
(0.5) E and F. (imperative; pretaught geometry
vocabulary)
T: okay,
(2)
- STEP S2: euh (1.5) next uhp place the point of (1) eh
B. (imperative; order vocabulary)
(1)
T: okay,
(0.5)
- S2: and ... make arc. (imperative; pretaught geometry
vocabulary)
(6)
S2: yes.
(2)
- STEP S2: eh next. uh (1.5) the point of intersection.
(1) the ... arcs. (order vocabulary; pretaught geometry
vocabulary)
T: mhm,
S2: through O.
(2)
T: like here?
(0.5)
S2: yes.
(4)
T: okay.
(1)
- STEP S2: eh the label, (1.5) uh (1) label (1.5) this
(1) circle and eh line. (1) intersection ... eh
(1) G and H. (imperative pretaught geometry vocabulary)
T: G and H. okay.
(2)
- STEP S2: and next .hhh eh connect the ... each point.
E and ... A and E. (imperative; order vocabulary;
pretaught geometry vocabulary)
T: mhm,
(1)
T: alright like all the way around?
S2: yes.
T: okay,
(19)
T: okay?
...
S2: yes

This procedure is over three times as long as the first one and the workshop participants agreed that it was much more complex. The overall organization is appropriate, as it starts with a goal followed by steps. All the important steps seem to be included, though there is sometimes some missing information, such as the size of the compass, which leads to the necessity for clarification. There is use of order vocabulary throughout, starting with ordinal numbers (up to *fifth*) and then the word *next*. There is the somewhat unusual choice of *consist* in the goal, rather than *construct*, which was taught in class, or *draw*. On the other hand, this student makes consistent use of geometry vocabulary, which was also taught in class. There is consistent use of the imperative, except for the third-to-last step, in which the verb (such as *connect*) is missing. The missing information in some of the steps, which leads to the need for clarification, was seen by participants as a major weakness. On the other hand, the student's ability to provide the necessary clarification mitigates this weakness. The majority of participants saw it as a solid 3, with one participant (the second author) leaning more towards 2, primarily because of the extra work required of the instructor to make sense of some of the steps.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The specific aim of the workshop was to show how genre-based criteria derived from SFL theory of language can be designed to evaluate a procedure genre and how these criteria can be applied to evaluate spoken language appropriate to a procedure genre. Although the focus of this workshop was on the evaluation of a spoken procedure genre, a genre-based approach to testing is not restricted to only one genre. In SFL, genre theory describes how texts are organized in different ways to achieve different social purposes. By designing an evaluation rubric that makes explicit the criteria of a particular genre, integrated with qualitative descriptor and rating bands, learners are made aware of what they can do and how well they can do it, in terms of independently constructing a particular

genre. The rubric described in this workshop draws on criteria from SFL research focusing on generic structure and lexico-grammatical resources that are appropriate to a procedure. Such a rubric can be a useful diagnostic tool for both teachers and students as well as a user-friendly and effective measure of students' overall performance in independently constructing a particular genre. SFL genre theory provides a solid theoretical basis for the evaluation of spoken (and written) texts. As shown through the workshop described above, genre theory can facilitate the explicit testing of students' mastery of genres that they have been taught. This has positive implications for the use of genre-based evaluation procedures as well as genre-based teaching curriculums in language education generally and for university-level English education specifically.

Feedback from the workshop participants indicated that they found the evaluation instrument to be both user friendly and effective. Although we cannot generalize and state that this would be the same for all teachers in all situations, this is considered to be a positive outcome, as it appears little or no formal background was required by the participants to use the evaluation instrument. As mentioned above, the range of ratings of the participants indicated that the evaluation criteria were used with an acceptable degree of reliability. This suggested that participants found the descriptions to be clear and relatively easy to understand and apply. We believe that the clarity of the criteria allowed participants to focus on what the students can do—not what they cannot do—as well as how well they can do it when evaluating their spoken performance in the particular genre.

During the discussion, it was suggested that there could be a need for half-point ratings, which could be added to the overall design of the evaluation instrument. The participants felt that this would make the ratings more accurate and reflect a truer indication of what the students were capable of producing in a particular genre.

It is also possible that the rubric used in this workshop can serve as a model for the evaluation of other genres, both spoken and written. This can be done by describing the generic structure and

language features that are appropriate to other genres, when they are integrated in a rubric with qualitative descriptor and rating bands similar to the one used in this workshop.

Bio Data

Damian Lucantonio is an associate professor at the University of Electro-Communications in Tokyo. He has a PhD in applied linguistics and has taught in all areas of English language education in Australia, Indonesia, and Japan. His research interests focus on the applications of systemic functional linguistics to English language education, in particular, genre theory.

Eric Hauser is an associate professor at the University of Electro-Communications in Tokyo and is also affiliated with the graduate faculty of the Department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. His research focuses primarily on the study of interaction involving L2 users of English. He has recent publications in *Language Learning* and *Pragmatics and Society*.

References

- Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring how texts work*. Sydney: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Eggs, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing casual conversation*. London: Cassell.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context and text: Aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 2, 181-199.
- Livingston, E. (2008). *Ethnographies of reason*. Hampshire, UK: Ashgate.

- Lucantonio, D. (2009). *Developing casual conversation skills of pre-school children learning English as a foreign language in the home context* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Technology, Sydney, Australia.
- Lucantonio, D. (2014). Teaching the research paper. In M. Pinto & D. Shaffer (Eds.), *The proceedings of the 2013 21st Korea TESOL International Conference* (pp. 177-186). Seoul, Republic of Korea: Korean TESOL.
- Martin, J. R. (1985). *Factual writing: Exploring and challenging social reality*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.
- Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Project. (1989). *A brief introduction to genre*. Sydney: Metropolitan East Region, NSW Department of Education.
- Paltridge, B. (2001). *Genre in the language learning classroom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Appendix

Evaluation Criteria

Rating scale for a spoken academic procedure.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Details</u>
0	Non-user	The student does not say anything, is unintelligible, or incoherent.
1	Intermittent user Use of language and organization of text often inappropriate.	The purpose is extremely difficult to understand. The student may seem to state some of the steps, but there does not seem to be much organization. There are serious problems with grammar (e.g., imperative) and/or vocabulary choice, including procedural and/or vocabulary related to the content of the procedure.
2	Limited user Use of language and organization of text occasionally inappropriate.	The purpose of the procedure may not be clear. The student states some of the steps, but they are difficult to understand. Some important steps seem to be missing. There are problems with the organization of the different steps. The recipient has to do a lot of work to make sense of the steps. There may be some problems with grammar and/or procedural or content-related vocabulary choice.
3	Satisfactory user Use of language and organization of text usually appropriate.	The purpose of the procedure is fairly clear. The goal of the procedure is clearly stated at the start. The student states the most important steps, though a few of these may be difficult to understand. Some relatively minor steps may be missing. There may be minor problems with organization, but they do not cause difficulty. While there may be some problems with grammar and/or vocabulary choice, the student attempts to use lexico-grammatical resources which are appropriate for the procedure.
4	Good user Use of language and organization of text generally appropriate.	The purpose of the procedure is clear. The student clearly states the most important steps and no necessary steps are missing. The overall organization is good, including a clear statement of the goal at the start. Lexico-grammatical resources are appropriate for the procedure, though there may be a few problems which do not impact the overall text. The ability to produce a complex procedure with sub-steps is emerging.
5	Excellent user Use of language and organization of text appropriate.	The purpose of the procedure is clear. The student clearly states the most important steps and no necessary steps are missing. No steps are difficult to understand. The goal is clearly stated at the start. The organization is good and the procedure is very coherent. Lexico-grammatical resources are sophisticated and appropriate for the context and purpose of the procedure and no language choices are problematic. The ability to produce a complex procedure with sub-steps is evident.