

**The AWADE Newsletter AY2025 Edition: Letter from the Coordinators**

Welcome to the AY2025 edition of *The AWADE Newsletter*. In this issue, we are pleased to feature two publications that reflect both the theoretical grounding and classroom-facing practice that characterize EAP instruction in our program. The first report is an interview with Professor Masatoshi Sato, whose insights speak directly to the value of academic English production for Japanese learners, particularly in an era of rapid technological change. Drawing on his extensive experience as an internationally recognized SLA researcher and academic writer, Professor Sato offers a timely and thoughtful perspective on the role of feedback, metacognition, and meaningful output in EAP writing. The second report, by Alex Garin, an AWADE lecturer, presents a principled and clearly articulated approach to teaching formulaic sequences to support spoken fluency in academic presentations. Closely aligned with relevant research, Garin's step-by-step framework provides a practical model that instructors can readily adapt for their own classrooms.

In addition to introducing the articles of this edition of *the Newsletter*, the letter from the coordinators also serves to share a summary of the academic year. AY2025 was another dynamic time at AWADE. The learning materials and assessments were updated to enhance the EAP experience for students. There were also enhanced FD opportunities for AWADE teachers. These efforts are intended to support both instructional consistency and fair, effective assessment. As we look ahead to AY2026, AWADE remains committed to reflecting on these developments and building on them, with the goal of equipping students and supporting instructors with the tools needed to meet future academic and professional challenges with confidence.

**The Value of EAP Writing for Japanese L1 Learners: In Conversation with Professor**

**Masatoshi Sato**

**By: Joseph P. Vitta, Global Education Center, Waseda University and Masatoshi Sato,**

**Universidad Andrés Bello**

AWADE is honored to interview Professor Masatoshi Sato, Ph.D. to learn about his views on the value of academic writing in English for Japanese L1 learners<sup>1</sup>. Dr. Sato offers a unique viewpoint on this matter as an L1-Japanese, internationally recognized scholar in second language acquisition with extensive expertise in academic publishing in English. In this ‘interview’ paper, Dr. Sato’s background (Part 1) is followed by his responses to our<sup>2</sup> initial questions about the value of academic English writing for Japanese learners (Part 2). Dr. Sato then responds to our follow-up questions (Part 3). Although this process has been undertaken with the specific AWADE context in mind, it is hoped that this report can be used within the broader Japanese EAP writing sphere as a reference point during a time of great change in the face of technological advancements including generative AI such as ChatGPT.

**Part 1: Introducing Professor Sato**

Born in Osaka, Japan, Masatoshi Sato earned a BA in Cross-Cultural Studies from Kobe University and a Graduate Certificate in TESOL from the University of New Mexico, before completing his MA in Second Language Education and PhD in Educational Studies at McGill University. He is currently a Professor of English at Universidad Andrés Bello, Chile, and holds Visiting/Distinguished Professor positions at Michigan State University, Curtin University, Anaheim University, Shanghai International Studies University, University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City, and East China Normal University. Dr. Sato has published widely in leading international journals, including *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *Language Learning*, *The Modern Language Journal*, *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *Language Awareness*, *Language Teaching*, *System*, and *Educational Researcher*. He has co-edited 10

volumes including those with *the Modern Language Journal* and *Language Teaching Research* as well as *John Benjamins*, *Routledge*, and *Cambridge University Press*, and he currently serves as Editor-in-Chief of *Language Awareness* (Taylor & Francis). His commitment to bridging research and practice is further demonstrated through initiatives such as *TESOLgraphics* (tesolgraphics.com) and *the Montreal Institute of Second Language Acquisition (MonISLA)*. As a recipient of the *ACTFL/MLJ Paul Pimsleur Award*, Dr. Sato's publishing and editorial leadership continues to shape global conversations on instructed second language acquisition, peer interaction, corrective feedback, and teacher education.

Dr. Sato, in sum, has leveraged his ability to use academic English to become one of the preeminent voices in instructed SLA and the nexus of language research and language teaching practice. Our interview with him seeks to exploit his achievements in this regard.

## **Part 2: Initial Questions from Our Program and Professor Sato's Responses to Them**

*Question 1. Thinking about the English instruction you received at Kobe University (and even in high school), what aspects of it prepared you for your career as an international scholar using English to share your research?*

**Response:** The way I was taught English-as-a-foreign-language was very typical and traditional grammar-translation methods. I don't recall any English classes that were given in English. So, all my teachers taught everything in Japanese and instructed us to analyze morphosyntactic differences between English and Japanese, to practice grammatical structures by translating sentences from Japanese to English or vice versa, and to memorize English words from a wordbook. Sounds familiar (hopefully not)? So, in terms of communicative competence, the English education I received in Japan did not prepare me for my academic career (or for any authentic use of English) at all.

However, for academic English that I use for my work (e.g., email communications, conference presentations, and publications), I must "admit" that there are some benefits that I

retrospectively appreciate from Japanese EFL education. For one, in order to be able to produce good writing, you need to practice writing. The training I received gave me opportunities to produce lots of writing especially for academic writing (EAP). For another, naturalistic learning (e.g., just living in Canada) would not give you much opportunity to be exposed to and practice low-frequency words that would not appear in normal conversations (that academic writing requires). So, mechanically memorizing vocab from vocab books helped me learn academic words. Also, writing lots of short essays was good practice for developing academic writing skills. So, as much as I am critical of Japanese English education, there are some benefits that I hope would not disappear in the future (due to the push for more communicative teaching). Recently, I have been thinking that a new research direction may be to focus on mechanical drills and their impact on L2 learning (which completely goes against the general agenda and history of SLA research).

*Question 1A. What are aspects of this instruction that you wish had been different?*

**Response:** What we know based on abundant research of how second languages are learned is that you need to (a) be exposed to the target language, (b) receive feedback, and (c) produce output. All those need to be done when you are trying to convey messages; that is, the language use needs to be meaningful, as opposed to, for instance, when you are trying to work on grammar exercises or performing a role play. So, I wish that the English education I received was more “meaning-based” involving the use of English. The use of English here includes more exposure to authentic language and more opportunities to speak and write the language. The caveat is, of course, the assessment reality in Japan (or pretty much anywhere else in the world); it is understandable and legitimate that second language teachers focus on teaching grammar if they want to help their students get a good score in a standardized test (such as *Center Shiken [Common Test for University Admissions]*).

*Question 2. Can you tell us a little bit about your motivation for choosing a career where your ability to write academic English would be so prominent?*

**Response:** To be honest, I didn't think about my English writing skills when I decided to pursue my current career (perhaps, I made the final decision to become a university professor towards the end of my doctoral studies). I was just naive and didn't know how important writing skills would be for my work. I would like to stress that writing skills are extremely important for being successful researchers at least in our field (or social sciences in general, I'd say). There are many researchers who have great minds for research ideas and skills to execute a project successfully including data collection and analysis. However, at the end of the day, a research project needs to be published to be shared with others; otherwise, it may become a waste of resources (e.g., a research grant, research assistants, participants' time, and the researcher's time). In order to publish, you need good and technical writing skills. This applies to first-language users of English too. It is true that second-language writers tend to make more errors; however, the number of errors, I would argue, does not define the quality of writing. I believe there are as many second-language writers as first-language writers who can produce coherent and convincing writing. I know this from my experience of being an editor of many volumes including *Language Awareness* (an international academic journal) as well as collaborating with over 50 scholars with various L1 backgrounds.

In terms of my writing, I sometimes (have to) look at my previous writing (e.g., for looking for particular references). Every time, I feel embarrassed because of the quality of my writing in the past. Let me rephrase: every time, I see improvement in my writing. I believe writing skills incrementally develop and keep developing, more so than other skills (e.g., listening, speaking, and reading skills). But, more so than other skills, it is difficult to see improvement by yourself. So, I would encourage you to write, write, and write. Do not worry about your improvement. And, do not reject feedback from someone or take it personally even

when you feel the feedback is off the mark. Also, it is very important to consider the readership. Who is your target? Teachers? Beginner researchers? Experienced researchers? Policy makers? General public? Then, adjust your writing style.

*Question 3. In this age of AI and LLMs where essays and academic reports can be produced at the click of a button, what is the value of teaching EAP writing to Japanese learners? What changes would you suggest in this new reality?*

**Response:** This is a big question that everyone is asking now. That is, what's the value of learning a second language when technology can produce the language that can be used to communicate and/or complete an assignment. For communication, it will take a year (or less) when you can communicate with speakers of any language with earpods that simultaneously translate two or more languages. For assignments, you can complete them and obtain the best score with AI. So, what's the point of learning second language skills, writing skills included?

I would argue, unsurprisingly, that there are lots of benefits of learning (and thus teaching) second language skills. Overall, I think we should focus on what happens during learning processes rather than what learning products one achieves at the end. During the learning process, you develop higher-order thinking skills which will be useful for any aspect of your life. Those skills include, for instance, metacognition, critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills. By being exposed to people, culture, beliefs, and ideas from different language users, you become a smarter and more compassionate person. This applies to EAP as well. The more academic papers you read, the more re-structuring your brain goes through. The more academic writing you produce, the more perspectives you develop (because you learn to understand how your writing would be read by other people).

So, in this era of AI, I would say two things. First, it is impossible to stop AI from being integrated into the education sector. Second, what we should aim at as educators (I haven't written about this anywhere yet so this is the first time I am expressing my idea in academic

writing!) is to teach students “how to use AI for their own learning benefits” rather than “how to use AI”. Teaching “how to use AI” is not difficult; it is a matter of teaching students useful prompts. “How to use AI” may include its ethical use as well (which is a lively research topic now) but yelling at students to be ethical would not work (I don’t think so). So, my proposal is to raise students’ metacognition of AI. Metacognition is called “knowledge of knowledge” and it entails how one perceives a learning task. So, in relation to AI, if, and only if, students (a) are convinced that AI can be a useful tool for developing their own second language skills, and (b) understand ways in which AI can help them develop their second language skills while completing an assignment, AI can be a very beneficial educational tool. Such metacognitive instruction can take a variety of forms and I believe it is an interesting and important research direction to test out how students’ metacognition is related to learning processes and outcomes when AI is used. If we discover that metacognition is a good predictor of learning with AI, we then can devise metacognitive instruction targeting AI use.

*Question 4. Tests like the TOEFL and IELTS sometimes highlight that the very top scorers are non-native speakers of English. The idea being that a functional view of language somewhat mitigates the notion that native speakers decide what the language is. In that same vein, what advantages do you feel Japanese learners can have when using academic English relative to native speakers?*

**Response:** This is a difficult question because I tend to see test-taking skills different from actual language skills. It is not surprising that some non-native speakers score higher than native-speaking counterparts because of the massive industry targeting test takers (i.e., the majority of second language learners). The industry is skilled at analyzing the patterns of standardized tests and teach those patterns to students. Students memorize the patterns and get a good score at the test. “Juku” and “yobiko” (i.e., cram school and university test prep, respectively) are good examples.

As I said before, I think that traditional language teaching has some benefits especially in the area of reading and writing. I guess, as a current second language researcher, I shall not support the traditional teaching. But, I do to an extent. However, I think language teachers, curriculum developers, and policy makers should be aware of the pendulum in educational research. Since the 1990s, communicative language teaching has been considered the most effective method; back then, grammar teaching, including corrective feedback, was deemed detrimental to second language learning. However, since then, empirical evidence has accumulated showing that explicit teaching (including explicit corrective feedback) is beneficial. This information can be taken in a wrong way by educators especially in the contexts where explicit teaching has/had been the norm, like Japan. Educators may believe that research evidence confirms that traditional teaching is good. The same can be said for a recent trend called translanguaging; this information may be taken as an approval of teaching English in Japanese or encouraging students to use Japanese as much as they wish. So, what I mean by traditional teaching here is a strong focus on reading and writing, as opposed to mechanical grammar-translation methods. Without such a focus, one cannot develop strong academic skills.

### **Part 3: Our Program's Follow-up Questions and Professor Sato's Responses**

Thank you for the insightful and robust answers to our questions. In response to your ideas, we would like to ask the following questions:

*Follow-up Question 1. You mentioned that effective language teaching features a process where students are “(a) exposed to the target language, (b) receive feedback, and (c) produce output.”*

*In your view, what constitutes optimal feedback for Japanese EAP writing students? \*\*Related to this point, how would you respond to those de-emphasizing the role of feedback?*

**Response:** Feedback has a positive impact on any type of learning including the learning of an L2. There is not much debate about this at this point (well, except for some theoreticians). I am a firm believer of practice and feedback. To improve any skill, whether it

be driving a car, playing the piano, or communicating in an L2, you need to practice a lot and receive/incorporate feedback. Eventually, you will reach a stage where you don't have to consciously think about what you are doing, like, you don't think about grammar or worry about mistakes when you are speaking in an L2 (just like a professional musician does not pay attention to their movements). I think this principle applies to EAP writing as well. Here, the important role of the teacher comes into play; they are the primary feedback provider in educational settings (I say "primary" because classmates can be a great source of feedback as well).

Having said that, I am tempted to say that "AI can do it!". I think AI can serve as a great feedback provider especially for L2 errors. However, feedback on the content of writing (e.g., messaging, coherence, cohesion, etc.) needs to be done by an experienced instructor. (You might realize that I am using the term "feedback" in a more generic way than "corrective feedback" or "error correction".) Teachers have limited time; it is infeasible, or at least extremely difficult, to give language-related AND content-related feedback to the assignments submitted by 30 students. So, I would say, let AI do the language-related feedback, and focus on content-related feedback. If the feedback targets the content, why not do it in the students' L1? I am supportive of using L1 for enhancing higher-order thinking skills (see my response below).

*Follow-up Question 2. We/I completely agree that, even in this age of AI, learning a second language, especially writing, helps to "develop higher-order thinking skills which will be useful for any aspects of our life (and that) those skills include, for instance, metacognition, critical thinking, and creativity." What can educators do to emphasize this notion and drive it home for Japanese students?*

**Response:** As I briefly explained before, metacognition is knowledge of knowledge. It is a type of higher-order thinking skill (albeit theoretically debatable). So, if you have a clear

idea as to why you are doing what you are doing for what purposes (metacognitive knowledge), and you can control this knowledge (metacognitive regulation), you have high metacognition. Let's apply this to L2 writing and think how metacognitive instruction can be best delivered. First, students need to understand that metacognitive instruction is different and separate from L2 instruction. Metacognitive instruction has almost nothing to do with L2 teaching. It is about stimulating students' brain so that they would approach L2 learning differently and take advantage of L2 activities for their learning benefits. To engage with such a complex thinking process, L1 is better than L2. At your therapy session in which you engage with your own thinking and feelings, do you think you would benefit from the time spent better in your L1 or L2? Second, metacognitive instruction needs to be given a separate time period so that students, or even the teacher, are fully aware that metacognition is a cognitive support but not a part of L2 teaching. It can be done in the first five minutes of a class or it can be delivered throughout the semester. It depends on how much metacognitive support the students require. Overall, the goal that teachers should keep in mind is "how can I make my students smarter learners?" Once the students understood (a) why they are asked to write an essay, (b) why it is important to write the draft by themselves (before getting an AI bot to proofread it), (c) why the teacher gives feedback, (d) why considering teacher's feedback is important, and (e) how they can improve their future writing, however the writing activity looks like, the students will benefit from the activity way more for their L2 development.

*Follow-up Question 3. You mentioned that teaching students how to use AI is not difficult in terms of teaching effective prompts, and this point makes sense. At the program level, there is sometimes an intention to have students write in a naturalistic setting without AI to home in on the development of the cognitive processes required to write in a second language. In your view, how can AI fit into programs with this intention?*

*Follow-up Question 3A. Should technology and content be separated or integrated when it comes to language education? In other words, should we teach language such that technology is only there to help with execution or should technology be a part of the content/pedagogy (e.g., teaching LLM prompting)?*

**Response:** The simple fact is that students will use AI no matter how many times the teacher (or the program) tells them not to. So, this is rather a reactive and pessimistic reason for integrating technology and language instruction. A more proactive and positive reason is that AI can be a useful tool for L2 learning. What we, as researchers and teachers, should be careful of is that the different levels of AI skills that individual students possess are not reflected in the quality of their final products. In other words, in an ideal world, every student knows how to use AI to comparable levels and uses it in comparable ways. To make this happen, yes, AI skills should be taught in L2 classes, I believe. A caveat is, of course, the limited instructional time especially in contexts like Japanese EFL education.

*Follow-up Question 4. Do you think secondary and tertiary education should move away from independent tasks (e.g., an essay or writing prompt addressing 'Do you agree/disagree with XYZ?') and focus more on integrated tasks (read a text, listen to some audio, and write a response) that need more integrated skills such as note-taking and summarization? While Japanese students certainly excel at independent tasks, we often see a very severe drop off in performance when it comes to integrated tasks.*

**Response:** This is a difficult question. I always think that L2 education should focus on skills that students will be able to use in their lives. After all, language is a communication tool (unlike other subjects like maths or science). So, based on this principle, I would say that independent tasks can be useful for some students (e.g., those who may become academics) but for other students (e.g., those who may write in the L2 in business settings), integrated tasks may be better. But, if we considered the importance of students' engagement with writing tasks,

I would assume integrated tasks outperform independent tasks (but this is an empirical question!).

### **Conclusion**

In this interview, Professor Sato has offered his valuable expertise on the present and future of EAP writing for Japanese students. *The AWADE Newsletter* and its housing program have undoubtedly benefitted from Dr. Sato's responses to our questions presented here. As the interview text makes clear, EAP writing still has value for our students even with the rise of AI. Learning how to write academic texts can develop students along cognitive and metacognitive lines while also exposing them to tasks and corresponding text types that they might encounter in their professional lives. What this interview also makes clear, however, is that L2 learning in general and L2 academic writing instruction in particular will change in the face of rapid technological developments. We agree with Professor Sato that EAP programs such as AWADE must continue to consider all aspects of the current technological landscape including how AI can be integrated in principled ways that support, rather than undermine, student learning. For Waseda students, this might mean understanding EAP writing not simply as a requirement to be completed, but as a process that fosters critical thinking, disciplinary awareness, and intellectual independence. Framed in this way, EAP writing retains its relevance and importance, even as the tools available to students continue to advance and evolve.

### **Endnotes**

1. Originally, the interview had been intended to focus on both EAP writing and speaking, but it quickly became clear that writing was the area that would be discussed.
2. Vitta as first author represented the AWADE side in this interview project, and when appropriate he communicated with other AWADE members to gain their perspectives.

## **Speaking Fluency in EAP Presentations: Memory and Formulaic Sequences in Task Performance**

**By: Alex Garin, Global Education Center, Waseda University**

Formal public speaking in English is often a challenging skill to master for EAP learners. A fluent and engaging academic presentation can require a significant amount of preparation, both for learners and EAP teachers (de Chazal, 2014). Fluent speech is described as performed in real time at a natural rate, and often measured in syllables per minute (Ellis, 2005). Two mutually dependent features have been highlighted as instrumental for developing the skill of spoken fluency in adult learners: formulaic language and procedural knowledge (Ellis, 2005; Wood, 2010; Wray, 2002). Wood (2010) defines formulas as “multiword units of language which are stored in long-term memory as if they were single lexical units” (p. 38). A common example of formula in EAP texts is a noun phrase (e.g. *fluency problem, task planning*). *Procedural knowledge* (knowledge of how to perform a task) requires internalization of ideas and language via task repetition, which is in contrast with knowledge about a task or *declarative knowledge* (Bygate & Samuda, 2005).

An academic presentation often aims to verbally summarize a critical argument based on research. Therefore, utilizing the two features cited above should be beneficial for reaching this goal. This paper aims to describe the problem of achieving speaking fluency in EAP presentations, show how recurring formulas help speaking proficiency, and propose a solution in the form of task planning and repetition.

### **The Fluency Problem**

Many EAP learners lack fluency in public speaking, due in large part to memory limitations. A large amount of new information puts a strain on the limited capacity of short-term memory, a processing constraint on intake and subsequent production (Ellis, 2005). Some of the difficulties related to this include synthesizing unfamiliar ideas from a range of sources,

novel vocabulary, and the length of the talk in a second language (L2) (de Chazal, 2014). The ideas to be presented are usually based directly on scholarly articles and books, or on students' papers citing these sources. Learners often have only a surface level of such knowledge and struggle to convey it in L2. A related problem for fluent delivery is both lexical and grammatical complexity of the content (Pallotti, 2009). The meaning, form and pronunciation of many words and phrases in scholarly texts are often partially or fully unacquired by learners. Furthermore, the length of AWADE's presentation task in its Beta course is 8-10 minutes, which means speaking at length in front of an audience in an academic setting. This is an intimidating task as most learners have little experience with public speaking in L2 in a university classroom.

The challenges described above can have a visible effect on the speakers. EAP presentations are usually assessed based not only on the quality and clarity of the content, but also on how well it is conveyed (de Chazal, 2014). Lack of familiarity with the material and language often leads to low confidence and disfluencies (e.g. hesitations, repetitions, restarts), which disrupt a smooth delivery. Additionally, the length of the presentation contributes to overreliance on the script or extensive notes. The common result is flat intonation, lack of spontaneity, low engagement and comprehension from classmates. To ease the memory strain and improve fluency, learners need time to process and internalize ideas and language.

### **Frequent Formulas and Speaking Proficiency**

There is an established relationship between formulaic language frequency, its range across different sources and proficient spoken production. Commonly recurring, context-specific formulaic sequences in learner speech are an important indicator of higher spoken proficiency (Kyle & Crossley, 2015). In an EAP classroom, this implies that teaching often co-occurring word combinations in spoken contexts could have a positive effect on the oral production in general, and on the quality of EAP presentations specifically.

Formulas are also beneficial for content organization and memory. Formulaic sequences can act as discourse markers, outlining the overall text structure and activating additional contextual information (Wray, 2002). For instance, for a talk based on this paper, they could serve as the title (e.g. *fluent presentations*) and section headings (e.g. *fluency problem, model presentation, planning strategy, task repetition*). Additionally, repeat practice of both individual sections and the whole talk could further strengthen procedural knowledge, benefiting fluency. This general to specific discourse pattern also creates an expectation on the part of the listener familiar with it, which helps comprehension. Planning and practice are described in more detail below.

### **Strategic Planning**

The first of three steps in planning is exposure to a good spoken model. It should raise awareness of positive fluency aspects, such as intonation, pace, and spontaneity. A good example of spoken input can further improve fluency by raising awareness of key formulaic sequences and interpreting their meaning and function from context (Wood, 2010). A teacher can plan a model presentation around 10-15 main ideas, each corresponding to a formulaic expression. The phrases are organized to reflect general/specific discourse patterns, acting as presentation title, slide titles, and bullet points (e.g. presenting this paper). It is also important to convey that the talk is not memorized verbatim. Instead, the familiar discourse pattern and key phrases are used in repeat production to improve spontaneity and activate additional detail in memory. An effective verbal model should give the learners a better understanding of the main assessment points and prepare them for planning.

Second, in order to better organize information from various sources, EAP learners then need sufficient planning time. Ellis (2005) argues that strategic planning (planning before the main task) has a positive influence on spoken fluency and lexical complexity. Students should write an outline of their talk using concise formulaic language. The purpose is to give their

ideas a more narrowed focus and improve audience comprehension. The outlines should be modeled on the teacher's presentation and submitted for feedback. Teacher feedback is crucial and should target the logic and organization of ideas. It should also help learners carefully select (and possibly pronounce) natural, level-appropriate and accurate language to activate more detailed information for each main idea. Guiding linguistic choices in this way should help learners proceduralize the language and express themselves more fluently.

After the outlines are checked, the third step is to transfer the same formulaic expressions to the PowerPoint slides in a way similar to the model. This could reduce the amount of slide text, as many learners often use sentences or even short paragraphs instead of bullet points. This should encourage internalization of the main ideas rather than reading from the slides. Decreasing the amount of text also eases comprehension for the listener, as the main focus is on the verbal message, not on the slides.

The planning steps described in this section should make the subsequent practice and delivery more organized, purposeful and confident. The learners would raise their awareness of which fluency aspects to focus on in their own production. They would also have higher confidence that the language in their talk is accurate, natural, meaning-focused and well-understood by the listeners. As a result, after the presentation is finished, the audience is more likely to be effectively informed on the topic and/or convinced by the speaker's stance.

### **Task Repetition**

After planning, learners should be ready to practice their talk. Task repetition has been shown to be important for fluency and internalization of formulaic language (Wood, 2010). Repetition also builds on strategic planning by strengthening the knowledge and retaining variety in the main ideas of verbal production (Bygate & Samuda, 2005).

There are many speaking fluency activities with task repetition. The most well-known is probably 4-3-2, with the same talk spoken to three different partners, increasing the speed

and decreasing the time with each new listener (Nation & Newton, 2009). This activity could therefore highlight the importance of spontaneity in natural spoken delivery. If the presenter is reading from or narrating a memorized script verbatim, the intonation and rhythm are more monotone, and the spontaneous effect is lost. This usually diminishes the level of engagement of the listeners. In 4-3-2, the same talk is repeated several times, with the speaker trying to summarize the main ideas faster and more concisely to each new classmate. The exact wording is slightly different each time, making the production more spontaneous. To continue the example of presenting this paper, each section of the presentation can be practiced without a script, with different partners, at a faster pace each time. This should ease memory strain and improve natural delivery.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, by combining an effective verbal model, strategically selected formulaic phrases, sufficient planning time and repeated practice, a more fluent presentation can be achieved. This may require some additional planning from the EAP teacher. In particular, the model presentation would need time and preparation. Additionally, individual or group feedback tutorials and repeated practice would necessitate dedicated class time. However, the end result is potentially worth it for developing an important and transferable skill of public speaking in EAP learners. Effective spoken communication is essential not only in EAP classes. It could also be of high relevance to other university classes the learners are taking, as well as in their future workplaces.

### References

- Bygate, M. & Samuda, V. (2005). Integrative planning through the use of task repetition. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Planning and task performance in a second language* (pp. 37-74). John Benjamins.
- de Chazal, E. (2014). *English for academic purposes*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Planning and task-based performance: Theory and research. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Planning and task performance in a second language* (pp. 3-34). John Benjamins.
- Kyle, K. & Crossley, S. (2015). Automatically assessing lexical sophistication: Indices, tools, findings, and application. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(4), 757-786.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.194>
- Nation, I.S.P. & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching EFL/ESL listening and speaking*. Routledge.
- Pallotti, G. (2009). CAF: Defining, refining, and differentiating constructs. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 590-601. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp045>
- Wood, D. (2010). *Formulaic language and second language speech fluency*. Continuum.
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.