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Introduction

Teaching presentation skills (PS) is one of the areas of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) that have made their way from in-service management training (Ellis and Johnson, 1994) to higher education within the framework of ESP courses offered by business colleges and economic and finance faculties of universities. Nowadays, graduates of business studies are expected to attend and/or make presentations most probably in English on a weekly basis during their business careers. At the same time, a survey on job-experienced learners of business English (BE) found that BE teachers are also expected to be able to make a presentation (Mészárosné Kóris, 2009), which might be a frightening expectation to teachers lacking business experience. The chapter provides an introduction to teaching presentation skills, which in many respects is similar to skills-based EFL teaching, completed by a comparison of the presentation teaching methods of two teachers in the form of CLIL through the insider perspectives.

What is a presentation?

The presentation can be traced back to the age-old art of rhetoric which was defined by the illustrious ancient orator, Cicero as “speech designed to persuade” (Eidenmuller, n.d., Scholarly Definitions of Rhetoric section, para. 3). The definition of a modern presentation offered by one of the earliest sources on BE teaching, Ellis and Johnson (1994, p. 222) is as follows: “a pre-planned, prepared, and structured talk which may be given in formal or informal circumstances to a small or large group of people. Its objective may be to inform or to persuade”.

For the purposes of the present chapter, business presentations are relevant as they are the type of presentation that English teachers are most likely to teach in CLIL. Sazdovska (2009, p. 245) offers the following definition for teaching purposes: “A business presentation is an extended talk given formally, most often by an individual before a group of people who constitute an audience, with the aim of achieving a commercial advantage (e.g. sell products or services, inform about corporate changes or performance, raise company or brand awareness, etc.)”.

The evolution and types of presentations

A look at the evolution of presentations shows a clear tendency of diversification. The political and philosophical speeches made in Ancient Greece can be considered the first presentations. Such presentations were made by Cicero, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and their contemporaries in the form of discourse. In the Middle Ages another type of presentation, the educational presentation, emerged in two areas: theology and science; which meant reading out quotations from famous, well-known texts to prove credibility (Kovács, 1991). Modern presentations abound in types according to their content, aim and audience: political, educative, academic, scientific, popular scientific, business, theological, marketing etc. (Carrington-Musci, 1991; Kovács, 1991; Martin and Pemberton, 2003; Medgyes, 1995; Moore, 2002; Simons, 2004); the list is probably endless as even the mentioned ones have subtypes.

It is not only the context of a presentation that can vary but also the channel through which it reaches its audience. Presentations can be made live as well as through the internet, they can appear on television, video or DVD without the presence of the speaker (Sazdovska, 2009) or even in the form of a computer file in which case a presenter is not always necessary.

McGee (1999) is the only source to mention the length of a business presentation taking it between 2 – 30 minutes. He adds that, in his long experience, most presentations take 8 - 12 minutes depending on the situation, the amount of time the audience has and their position in the company hierarchy. The higher their position, the less time the presenter is given. Business
presentations are typically accompanied by visual aids, and other techniques to keep the audience's attention such as gestures and eye contact. The message of the presenter is usually reinforced through circling documentations like reports. McGee claims that the typical audience of a business presentation is a small group of not more than 16 people, sometimes the audience size is larger than that. McGee also underlines that business presentations have expected types of language, politeness, level of formality, often set phrases, format and behaviour, even a dress code relevant in the specified context. The small size of the audience is one of the factors that guarantee conformity to the norm.

**Group presentations**

When discussing presentations, sources usually refer to one presenter and several people in the audience. However, in some cases, for example in higher education (HE) classes with too many students compared to the little time available for practice, the setting is reversed: there are up to four or five people in a group of presenters and only one or two members in the audience representing the school. Even sources by professional business presentation trainers rarely mention group presentations; one of the few is Boyd (2003). Though what he can offer is just the usual list of do-s and don't-s of business advisors that used to be published in printed form and appear nowadays on the internet, the list at least provides a starting point for HE students when having to prepare their first group presentation.

Németh (2006) describes group presentations at scientific or press conferences, conference workshops and round-table talks. In her definition, a group presentation is a session when a given topic is presented by several presenters. Such presentations have a specific code of conduct including all the presenters being present and visible during the whole event, they take their turns in a particular order according to their roles. The topic under discussion, the presenters' aims and appearance show homogeneity. The advantages of a group presentation are that it is more interesting and more respectable for the audience, it is more authentic both for the presenters and the audience; also, beside causing a pleasure of joint work, it largely diminishes presenter anxiety. The disadvantage is that group presentations might result in many more blunders than single person presentations. A typical example is the metacommunication of the presenters. A group presentation should be regarded as a carefully co-ordinated team effort implemented on stage, in front of the public, which can only be successful if the participants' cooperate. Their metacommunicative messages should be in unison, otherwise the whole group's work will be downgraded by the audience. Also, it is difficult to keep to the pre-arranged roles, time and content. Some presenters might talk too long, or digress from the topic, or say something that is not in line with the others' notions regarding content.

What business presenters can utilise from her description is that one should consider if the chosen topic is suitable for group presentation, the aims should be clarified, each presenter should be given a proportional role, there should be a group leader who introduces the presentation and the presenters and pays attention to all present as well as the time limits, there should be a choreography as to who says what in which order and for how long, and that special attention should be paid to questions. Presenters are also advised to prepare for answering questions; they must decide what they want to speak about in their own speeches and what they want to discuss only if it arises. It is vital to consider what questions might arise in terms of content; even in spite of thorough preparation, 20 to 30 percent of the questions might take the presenter by surprise. Also, it is important to clarify how the questions will be answered: one by one, collectively, collected in written form, collected before the session, etc.

**The genre of the business presentation**

The business presentation being a relatively new genre has been addressed by few studies. The communicative purpose is central to defining a genre, most genre studies elaborate on that aspect. Regarding business presentations, McGee (1999) explains their purpose from two angles. "The aim of the presentation, from the speakers' perspective, is to inform or persuade. The aim from the listeners' perspective, is to obtain information in order to make a decision at some
point in the future” (The business presentation as a speech event section, para. 1). The business people Pozdena (2010) interviewed for her research indicated that they follow a kind of seductive strategy to achieve persuasion called “selling themselves” (p. 60). They try to create an atmosphere in which the audience trusts the presenter so that the subsequent selling becomes much easier. Thus a gradual goal structure can be detected: appealing to the audience, establishing trust, selling a product or service.

Sazdovska (2009) in her intentionality model defines the context of business presentations as follows. The rationale, i.e. the context in the case of business presentations is comprised of the setting, the discourse community and the communicative purpose. The setting refers to the time and venue of the presentation together with the occasion of the presentation. The discourse community is made up of business people, most probably speakers of international English. Discourse communities are often established based on sharing a certain characteristic for example identical first language or geographic affiliation, in this case business people have an endeavour in common, namely profitability. The discourse community might have subgroups based on “familiarity, status, age, gender, nationality, religious or political affiliation” (p. 246). The communicative purpose is to achieve some economic benefit either in the literal sense, i.e. profit or in the non-literal sense, for example awareness raising, improving work standards, developing efficiency, etc. When preparing a talk, the so-called hidden agenda or an implicit aim such as achieving promotion, and the hidden audience, meaning the leaders receiving information indirectly, should also be taken into consideration. In Sazdovska’s model, these are also included in the communicative purpose.

The role of form and register

Presentations usually consist of two sections: a monologue, the main part of the presentation told by a single speaker and a dialogue part, i.e. the question-and-answer session at the end of the talk. These two parts need to be treated differently.

Thompson (1994) discussing dialogues versus monologues classifies business presentations as monologues where “the turn-taking machinery is suspended” (p. 59) and points out that monologues are close to written texts in that they are both carefully planned producing a textual whole and produced by one person. At the same time, monologues are delivered and perceived in real time, therefore, the listeners have little chance to retrieve the exact wording used; which makes presentations similar to discourse. Powell (1996) also compares the best presentations to conversations between the speaker and the audience. In this respect, similarity can be discovered to another ancient philosopher, Plato’s definition of rhetoric: “the art which treats of discourse” (n.d., para. 28).

At the end of the monologue section, presentations have a turning point and change into real dialogues, which causes additional difficulties to the presenter. The mode and register shifts, the rather formal monologue is followed by more or less informal questions and answers. The presenter’s exclusive leading role is challenged, his or her feeling of security provided by the pre-prepared nature of the monologue section is weakened or might even be lost due to the questions that audience members ask. The questions may partly be predicted by the presenter and prepared an answer for, however, the presenter’s strategic competence still needs to be activated to handle unforeseeable content and questioner personality.

The questions and answers session

Course books dedicated to presentation skills in English (for example Powell, 1996 and 2010) attempt to give an exhaustive list of possible types of questions a presenter might face (such as clarification, factual, opinion, difficult, hostile, etc. questions) and to teach techniques for tackling them. Probably, such lists are based on course book writers’ personal experiences as research has identified some question and answering types not treated in course books. Bereczky and Sazdovska (2005) analysed student presentations in a business college and identified a new type of question. The layered question, when the questioner asks a series of questions within a single turn, puts the presenter under pressure by straining the memory. The
layered question can take the form of narrowing focus, providing alternatives or posing a group of related questions. In an extreme case, they observed a question containing six subquestions. Such questions seem to be difficult for learners to handle, even for students who are at a near native level of proficiency. There is an obvious need to point this out to students and to instruct them to split a layered question into its constituents and answer each of the subquestions one at a time.

Furthermore, Bereczky and Sazdovska (2005) pointed out that not all types of questions treated in course books actually appeared in the question-answer session of the examined student presentations, namely unnecessary, irrelevant and personal questions did not occur. Also, they found that one of the phases of presentation explicitly taught by the course book their participants used was completely missing in the student presentations they analysed. The ending round of the question answer session is making sure the questioner is satisfied with the answer, typical expressions that can be used are "Does that answer your question?", "Is that clear?" and "May we go on?". None of these phrases appeared in the 17 presentations observed; in fact, the whole round was missing. The authors inferred that this round is not necessary since questioners usually give up the floor only if they are satisfied with the answer. The questioner's "thank you" or "yes, I see" or even just a nod was a sign of questioner satisfaction to the presenters and they went on to take another question. The initial conclusion from the lack of the round was that course book materials should be adjusted, however, the phase probably has relevance when presenting in front of larger audiences than a classroom.

The practical side of teaching PS

Presentations are a new area for foreign language instruction; there are no universally accepted standards yet. The first books written on teaching PS in English addressing teachers and students of BE were published in the 1990s (Campbell, 1990; Comfort, 1995; Cotton and Robbins, 1993; Powell, 1996). PS is one of the areas of ESP that come from management training (Ellis and Johnson, 1994); even a few years ago PS was only taught to in-service business staff. In Hungary, undergraduate business courses did not use to provide any explicit instruction in PS; though they occasionally required students to make presentations on certain business topics (Kovács, 1991). One of the first attempts to instruct students in presenting in English was the experiment conducted at the University of Economics, Budapest, described by Kovács, where foreign language teachers made presentations on linguistic, cultural and business topics in the foreign language they were teaching in order to serve as good examples for students for their presentations in the future both in the school and in the business environment. By now, we know that giving a good example, which was an innovative idea in the 1990s, is not enough on its own. Nevertheless, there are hardly any survey data available on current practices in teaching PS.

The communicative approach in teaching presentation skills through CLIL

The endeavour of contemporary language teaching to develop students’ communicative competence, i.e. "the ability to use a language" (Tarone & Yule, 1989, p. 17), also applies to teaching presentation skills through CLIL. The importance of communicative competence for professional communication has been emphasised by Kurtán (2004). She notes that though communicative competence is the precondition of effective communication, a related concept, intercultural competence must also be developed if students are to be prepared for an international labour market.

Though presentation classes in tertiary education outside English speaking countries constitute EFL environment, all four competencies are involved in the instruction provided, which is also reflected in the content of the most widely used course books (Comfort, 1995; and Powell, 1996) though they do not explicitly list references. Grammatical competence is catered for in the form of covering the most common structures and vocabulary to enable students to communicate their ideas in a comprehensible and accurate form. As to research into the
elements of communicative competence, McGee (1999) originates non-native speakers’ presentation skills in both linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects.

The above course books treat discourse competence focusing on three main aspects: organising content, delivering a presentation and listening to, i.e. being able to follow and understand a presentation. Concerning organisation of content, two basic structuring principles are mentioned in research on presentations: the opening, agenda, body, closing (OABC) framework (Baker and Thompson, 2004) and the situation, purpose, audience and method analysis (SPAM) model of creating professional presentations (Silye and Wiwczarski, 2003).

The mentioned course books treat sociolinguistic competence through instruction regarding varying levels of formality, creating rapport with and exerting influence on the audience. Research has been more concerned with intercultural aspects.

Although the area of strategic competence has not enjoyed much attention in research perhaps due to the wide-spread belief that communication strategies cannot be taught, both of the above mentioned course books devote several chapters to explicitly teaching the techniques of effectively starting and ending a presentation, question types that are likely to appear during the question-and-answer session at the end of presentations as well as to suggested strategies for answering them. Thus, the course books imply that these strategies are teachable. Thereby, agreeing with the similar view expressed by Tarone and Yule (1989) Bereczky and Sazdovska (2005) tested this assumption by analysing 17 students’ presentations at the end of a presentation skills course. They found that most of the answering techniques were successfully applied by student presenters. However, the question welcoming phrases (e.g. That’s a very important question.) were used somewhat schematically causing one presenter to answer a question with the following words “That’s a very important question and now I can’t tell you ...” (p. 71). Regarding instruction, the conclusion drawn from these findings was that while the rarely appearing question types and the satisfaction checking strategy might be given less attention in instruction, clarification on the side of the presenter and discouraged practices like directly saying “no” would deserve more attention.

Teaching PS is largely influenced by the teaching material used. This is even more true in classes where the teacher has not had the opportunity to make numerous business presentations like most ESL/EFL teachers. Sazdovska (2009) pointed out that PS course books meant for ESL/EFL learners rarely provide contextual information about their sample presentations, which information is usually present in materials for native speakers learning PS in their mother tongue. Information on the situational context would greatly contribute to students’ sociolinguistic competence.

Sazdovska (2009), nevertheless, notes that with the development of technology it has become really easy to find real presentations on the internet and study them with students. One can also find professional presenters’ own websites with videos featuring the trainer presenting (for instance Boyd, 2012). Such videos will be much appreciated by in-company students who can compare their own experiences to the trainer’s performance and comment on the level of professionalism, its usefulness and life-likeness in their work context. Such sources are also important for teachers who have not gained business work experience and who have not had many opportunities to perfect their presenting skills.

Apart from role-plays and simulations favoured by the Communicative Approach heading towards fluency and comprehensibility (Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Kennedy & Bolitho, 1984) a recent trend, i.e. the task based approach suits presentation skills instruction perfectly; and, in fact, is highly recommended by several sources (e.g. Mennim, 2003; Sowden, 2003).

**The teacher’s role**

Teaching presentation skills constitutes a complicated task not only for the learner but also for the teacher. Similarly to learners, teachers have to cope with two tasks at the same time: they teach a foreign language and a professional skill simultaneously. Both Ellis and Johnson (1994) and Biri (2004) identify one of the most debated issues among Business English teachers as the question of teaching language or skills. They conclude that though in some respects the ESP
teacher is a skills teacher, he or she is always first a language teacher. Darn (2009) states that CLIL classes much resemble skills-based EFL classes in terms of task types, however, content is as important as language.

**PS teacher interviews**

The presentation as a typical element in BE classes, as well as a course requirement in most college subjects emerges as a good point for comparison between instruction provided by an English teacher and instruction provided by a subject teacher. Conclusions can be drawn regarding PS instruction for teacher education. In an investigation for her dissertation Bereczky (2012) studied a franchise business college operated in Hungary. On the basis of course data, two basic types of teachers provided instruction on presentations in the selected franchise business college, teachers with a TOEFL degree and teachers with a business degree from various fields of economy. The investigation hypothesised that the situation was similar in franchise business colleges in Hungary where the language of tuition is English and that the teacher’s prior education led to differing teaching methods, which might in turn influence the effectiveness of instruction. Therefore, the research question for the investigation was how the teacher’s education (business degree vs. TEFL degree) influenced the methodology used for teaching PS.

Two teachers of the selected business college in Budapest were interviewed in an attempt to gain data enabling comparison between their PS teaching practices. Both teachers were Hungarian, non-native speakers of English; their names used herein are pseudonyms. The teachers were chosen by typical case sampling; Árpád, a male teacher of 35 had an MSc degree in Economics, while Berta, a female teacher of 29 had an MA in English Language and Literature and a Certificate in Teaching English for Business).

At the time of investigation Árpád was teaching Contemporary Business Management, while Berta was teaching Business English to the students observed. Both teachers included instruction on making presentations in their coverage of the mentioned subjects, and both subjects required students to make a final presentation as part of their assignments for the course. Students in the Contemporary Business Management class were expected to present in groups of three or four for about 15-20 minutes, whereas students in the Business English class had to present individually for approximately 10 minutes. Students observed in the two classes were not identical.

For the purposes of the presented investigation, the questions related to the following areas, originally developed for a comprehensive PS teaching survey using an interview protocol (Appendix B), were retained: the teacher’s education and teaching experience, PS course content, feedback and assessment. To complete the investigation, seven further questions were added about the teacher’s opinion on his or her own presentation teaching practices, the problem of teaching a skill in a foreign language and ways of developing the effectiveness of teaching. For triangulation purposes, altogether 30 international students were observed while making presentations in the courses taught by the interviewees. The observations were put down in the form of impressionistic field notes.

**Results of PS investigation**

In describing the findings of the interviews, the order of the interview protocol sections are followed.

**Background: Teaching in general**

Árpád has been teaching for seven years. He holds an MSc in Economics and prior to teaching he earned several years of direct business experience at a major, international auditing firm. He manages a small accounting firm of his own. At the investigated institute, he teaches Professional Development, Contemporary Business Management, Managing Self and Others, and other management subjects. He deals with Presentation Skills within the subjects he teaches in the first year, for example in the course of Professional Development presenting takes up 25%,
Teaching presentation skills at the time of investigation

Árpád has taught Presentation Skills for seven years. He attended several in-service courses while working for the auditing firm on making successful presentations, but he has never been instructed to teach the subject. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that it is common practice in HE to employ experienced experts of certain fields with or without a pedagogic degree relevant to their specialisation. Berta has taught Presentation Skills for three years, she has a Certificate in Teaching English for Business, which includes presentations. The course leading to that certificate was organised by the London chamber of Commerce and contained both presentation practice and methodology for teaching the subject.

Both teachers were aware that teaching PS is dealt with in several subjects simultaneously in their institution, but is mainly addressed in Business English and Professional Development during the first year. Almost all other subjects also required students to make presentations, usually in small groups of 3 or 4, where the teachers are free to include as much information about presenting as they want, most of them describe the evaluation criteria and some provide even more instruction. Neither teacher had detailed information on what the other teacher deals with in terms of presenting.

The basics of methodology include the following. Árpád teaches presentations in lectures and seminars, he shows student presentations video recorded in previous years and points out positive and negative instances and practices; his students are expected to make a group presentation, which is also recorded, at the end of the term about an economic topic. Berta only instructs in seminars, she also illustrates presentations but she shows presentation teaching videos; she also deals with rhetoric elements of presenting beside organisation and delivery (for a sample course content see Appendix A). During the course, students practice presenting with several short tasks solved in small groups and pairs (to form an audience) as well as individually. However, the final presentation is to be made individually, in front of the whole class, and is not recorded.

The two teachers agreed that the fact that PS were taught in a foreign language was more of a problem for students than for the teacher. Árpád attributed the students' problem to the need to learn the presenting techniques at the same time as the specialised vocabulary, while Berta attributed it to students' lower than intermediate English proficiency. Árpád also mentioned students' problem with understanding presentations "when their English is not good enough". Berta asserted that teaching in a foreign language is no problem for her, as she had studied it in English and had never taught it in any other language. Árpád, however, described his teaching experiences as follows: "Well, first I was terribly afraid of it, but later I got used to it. [...] Obviously, my way of expression is less sophisticated than in Hungarian."

Berta did not mention many changes in her methodology compared to a GE class caused by the fact that presenting is taught in a foreign language. She only mentioned that when the students' English proficiency is lower, she cannot use some of her materials or she has to adapt them. Árpád mentioned making an effort to achieve that students use English not only during whole class communication and presenting but also in small group activities. He uses the same transparencies in English and Hungarian, only the language is different, and he uses the same cases as illustration, for example in games. What is different when he teaches in English is that he gives simpler examples, he uses more paraphrasing and he returns to the same thing from time to time.

When asked about effects of their prior education on their teaching the two teachers reacted significantly differently. Árpád repeated twice that he does not care too much about grammar;
though he tries to speak accurately, he does not "have a bad conscience about mistakes". He is more concerned about inaccuracies concerning economics. He does not consider it his task to correct grammatical mistakes, except very serious cases, nor does he have time for that within the limitations of the term time. However, he requires that students state only things in their presentations which are accurate, adequate and valid in terms of economics. He said one does not need to be an English teacher to be able to teach presenting in English, but the teacher's language proficiency must be over intermediate. The fact that he reacted emotionally together with his specifying "English" as the exclusive area he would like to learn more about to develop his teaching presentation skills and repeating the word three times reflect that Árpád is concerned about his language proficiency. In fact, he already has the plan to do so, he would like to teach as guest lecturer in an English-speaking country for a while. Berta commented that she does not feel it a problem that she does not hold a business degree, adding that of course one can always develop and she would be interested in learning more about how presentations are used in business life, for instance she would be willing to take a specialised course in that field. Presently she relies on information that her students involved in company courses provide about their companies' practices in this respect. She is also interested in rhetorical skills, relations between the presenter and the audience, and feels psychology would give her more insight into persuasion through presenting.

**Course content**

Both Árpád and Berta marked the following items: preparation, adapting to the audience, brainstorming, how to arrange the presentation site, visual aids, handouts, effective presentation openings, structuring content, when to pause in a sentence, how to use voice for emphasis, how to use repetition for emphasis, how to create rapport with audience, how to deal with questions, using body language, the questions a presenter gets from the audience.

Only Árpád marked the following: differences between written and oral communication, transparencies, handouts, marking/connecting presentation phases, expressing causes, intonation, build-ups (using a short and simple conclusion to convince audience), simplification for powerful effect, words and expressions used in business, formal/informal style differences, question types addressed to a presenter, other stylistic elements, summarising content at the end of a presentation, question answering strategies, other: balance of presenters at group presentations. Only Berta marked the following: dramatic contrasts, tripling (lists of three to make something memorable), knock-downs (opposing statements to prove your point), useful expressions, linking words, question answering strategies, rehearsing a presentation.

Neither teacher marked: technical skills: OHP, PowerPoint, whiteboard, projector, giving examples to illustrate the speaker's point, expressing effects, expressing purpose, pronouncing technical words, word stress, sentence stress, how to use grammar to focus audience attention on message, how to use adjectives to positive/negative emphasis, rhetorical questions, machine gunning (using lists of 6+ to impress audience), words used with different meaning in business (e.g. capital), business word partnerships, fixed expressions/collocations (e.g. get down to business), reducing stress when speaking.

As to other ways of improving instruction efficiency, Árpád mentioned inviting guest lecturers to the school who could make a presentation on their specialisation area related to his subject such as achieving professional appearance, CV writing and job interviews and students could study both the topic and the way of presentation. Berta explained that she would like to provide more opportunities for students to make presentations, which she could record on video and analyse together with the students. She would also like to take her students to companies to watch professional presenters "in action" so as to raise their awareness about the relevance of these skills.

Árpád says he is content with the way he teaches Presentation Skills because, though it is certainly not perfect, he is present at the students' first attempts, during some of their course presentations through the years as well as at their final dissertation presentation, and he can see the development. Also, this way students get the necessary experience to form a good basis for
further training in their future jobs. Berta is not totally content with her own teaching due to lack of time and technical resources dedicated to the subject by the school.

**Implications of PS interviews and PS student questionnaires**

One interesting finding is that if a teacher provides instruction in a subject which is made up of knowledge from two originally distinct areas, such as Presentation Skills, and if that teacher is only competent in one of those fields, he or she will probably feel the need to gain the missing knowledge, though they might not state that the lack of information causes feelings of uncertainty. As expected, the teachers’ education caused some differences in their perception of methodology used in instruction, they state in their interviews that they concentrate more on their specialisation area. Focusing on the teacher’s field of expertise is not accurately reflected in the proportion of the areas they ticked on the instruction content checklist (Appendix B, section B), Árpád also marked several points of rhetoric that he covers. Both teachers asserted that teaching the subject would deserve more time, probably a term, which might refer to a necessary change in the scheme curriculum.

An important finding from the students’ point of view is that when assessing student presentations, both teachers evaluate the elements that they have covered during instruction and that the teachers are not constrained by rigid, uniform evaluation criteria, they can tailor evaluation to the pace of development of the class (for evaluation sheets see Appendices C and D). This finding points to a clear development in methodology compared to the practices of the 1980s (Kovács, 1991) when students of similar institutions were expected to make good presentations solely on the basis of watching lectures. Finally, though both teachers know about the existence of the other, there seems to be no sign of co-operation. Sharing tasks as well as placing double emphasis on especially difficult areas could compensate for lack of time.

The observation of student presentations lead to the conclusion that class B members, taught by Berta were more at ease during presenting, the reason might be the experience they gained in small groups combined with the lower number of students in the class. Class A students, taught by Árpád seemed to have made deeper research into their areas, but serious grammatical and vocabulary problems left the impression that their message was ambiguous. Some groups had not agreed on task allocation or had not rehearsed enough, which lead to confusion about who should handle the projector while a member was speaking.

**CLIL in Hungary**

The integrated treatment of language studies is a European Union priority and is supported through treating parts of international literature, history, geography, etc. in other than the official language of the school (Kézikönyv ..., 2007). CLIL is also included in Hungarian language teaching policies, for example the Világ – Nyelv program (World – Language Programme) of the Hungarian Ministry of Culture (2003-2008) was promoting language learning at all levels of education - primary to tertiary - and teaching any subject in tertiary education in a foreign language (Nikolov, 2007). The Hungarian government’s action plan entitled Tudást mindenkinek! Cselekvési terv 2006–2010, 2006, parts 13–17 (Nikolov, 2007) is another example of fostering CLIL.

The first criterion of organising CLIL is the teacher who can be of two kinds: a language teacher who has learnt another subject or a subject teacher who is trained in teaching their subject in a non-official language. At the moment there are few of them at the European level, and the educational system should pay more attention to training such teachers. The second step is to create collaboration between language and other subject teachers (Kézikönyv ..., 2007; Nikolov, 2007). So a CLIL teacher is a ‘rare bird’. Most language teachers in Hungary are not prepared to teach another subject in a target language (Nikolov, 2007). Though the few existing bilingual schools are very successful (Bognár, 1999), Hungarian teacher education is not prepared for this type of training (Bognár, 1997). This is also reflected in Nikolov and Öveges’ (2009) finding that out of the 438 vocational schools they surveyed only two mentioned CLIL as an issue to be solved saying that they wished to receive some course materials for such purposes.
and no respondents mentioned CLIL among the successes or other respects of their schools. The number of schools offering CLIL education in Hungary shows a sharp rise from 15 secondary schools (Bognár, 1997) in 1987 to 78 primary and 132 secondary schools in 2008 (Vámos, 2009) providing 2-8 subjects in CLIL. The latest regulation of CLIL education in Hungary is the decree of the Hungarian Ministry of Human Capacities on dual language institutions (EMMI Rendelet, 2013), which deals with the minimum output requirements in terms of language proficiency by each year of such education as well as with the content of such courses.

Regarding PS teaching in HE, similarly to Austria (Alexander, 1999), HE in Hungary expects, candidates for BE teacher positions with two degrees: business and teaching (Bereczky, 2005). As this is rarely a viable option, the second best choice is economists or people with a business degree with some English knowledge. BE teachers’ situation in terms of qualification is similar to that of CLIL teachers in Europe who tend to be qualified either in language teaching or teaching a non-language subject but very rarely in both, which is the stated ideal according to European Union policies (Eurydice report, 2006).

References


MOORE, P. (2002). The good, the bad and the very ugly. NZ Business 16, 33-38.


**Suggested further reading**


For sample presentations, visit: https://www.ted.com
### Appendices

**Appendix A:**
Sample Presentation Skills Course Content (Ellis & Johnson, 1994, p. 216)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Skills Training</strong></th>
<th><strong>Language Training</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Use of visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referring to visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content matter of the introduction</td>
<td>Organising the content of the introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content matter of the body</td>
<td>Organising the content of the body, including signals and link words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content matter of the conclusion</td>
<td>Organising the content of the conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical skills: putting forward views</td>
<td>Handling rhetorical skills in the second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>Choosing language for the style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical questioning and tactical handling of questions</td>
<td>Using appropriate forms in the second language to achieve tactical ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:  
Interview Protocol to Assess Teachers’ Background and Teaching Methodology

Teaching Presentation Skills (PS) Interview Protocol  Code:..................  

A Background  
Teaching in general  
1. How long have you been teaching? (years)  
2. What training have you received? Degrees + courses  
3. Do you have experience in any other fields? (If yes, please specify.)  
4. Do you also teach any other subject than PS? (If yes, please specify.)  
5. Describe the education your school provides.  

Teaching PS  
6. How long have you been teaching Presentation Skills? (years)  
7. What training have you received to teach PS?  
8. Who organised those courses (if any)?  
9. How would you describe teaching Presentation Skills in your school?  
10. In what form do you teach PS?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Seminars</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Other: ..................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Are you content with the way you teach PS?  
12. What has contributed to that?  
13. How do you feel about teaching PS in English and not in your / your students’ mother tongue?  
14. Does it cause any difficulties or changes in your teaching methodology?  
15. How does your education (the fact that you have a degree in economics / TEFL) affect your teaching?  
16. What fields would you like to learn more about in order to make your PS teaching more effective?  
17. Could you mention any other ways you could develop your PS teaching? (e.g. making more business presentations yourself, developing your English, recording students’ Ps / professional presenters, inviting professional presenters to class, etc.)  

B Course content  
18. What do you work on during your PS classes:  
a. - differences between written and oral communication  
b. – preparation  
c. – adapting to the audience  
d. – brainstorming  
e. – how to arrange the P site  
f. – visual aids  
g. – technical skills: OHP PowerPoint whiteboard projector  
h. – transparencies  
i. – handouts  
j. – effective presentation openings  
k. – marking/connecting presentation phases  
l. – giving examples to illustrate the speaker’s point  
m. – expressing causes  
n. – expressing effects  
o. – expressing purpose  
p. – pronouncing technical words  
q. – structuring content
r. -word stress
s. -sentence stress
t. -intonation
u. -when to pause in a sentence
v. -how to use voice for emphasis
w. -how to use grammar to focus audience attention on message
x. -how to use adjectives to positive/negative emphasis
y. -how to use repetition for emphasis
z. -rhetorical questions
aa. -dramatic contrasts
bb. -tripling (lists of 3 to make something memorable)
cc. -machine gunning (using lists of 6+ to impress audience)
dd. -build-ups (using a short and simple conclusion to convince audience)
ee. -knock-downs (opposing statements to prove your point)
ff. -simplification for powerful effect
gg. -how to create rapport with audience
hh. -words used with different meaning in business (e.g. capital)
ii. -business word partnerships
jj. -words and expressions used in business
kk. -formal/informal style differences
ll. -fixed expressions/collocations (e.g. get down to business)
mm. -useful expressions
nn. -how to deal with questions
oo. -question types addressed to a presenter
pp. -using body language
qq. -reducing stress when speaking
rr. -linking words
ss. -other stylistic elements
tt. -summarising content at the end of a P
uu. -the questions a presenter gets from the audience
vv. -question answering strategies
ww. -rehearsing a P
xx. -other: ........................................

C Assessment and feedback

19. Are the students’ presentations marked?
20. Are the students’ mini presentations marked (if any)? If yes, how?
21. How do you think the (absence of) marking affects students?
22. What feedback do you get about your PS teaching practices?
23. What do students write/speak about when giving feedback?
24. Are you content with the way your students make Ps?
25. What has contributed to that?
26. How do you think students can become better presenters?
Appendix C:
Sample Presentation Evaluation Sheet (based on Cotton & Robbins, 1993, p. 44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Points to consider</th>
<th>Grade (1-5)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Evidence of careful preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Clarity, appropriacy to audience/subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Extent, relevance, appropriacy, subject knowledge, research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Message support and reinforcement, variety, humour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Coherence, clarity, appropriacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual aids</td>
<td>Appropriacy, clarity, handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Pace, enthusiasm, rapport/eye contact, audibility, intonation, confidence, body language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Clarity, accuracy, fluency, appropriacy, pronunciation, signalling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Clarity of message, achievement of objectives, interesting?, enjoyable?, informative?, motivating?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grade scale: 1=unacceptable, 2=poor, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent
## Appendix D:
Evaluation Sheet Used for Students’ Group Presentations at Számalk School of Economic Studies, Budapest

### COURSE WORK ASSESSMENT

**AMIS/BABS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP NAME:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NAMES

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]

### PRESENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Structure of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Speed, Voice, Word choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Audience contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Visual aids/Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 All members involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Handling questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50%

### DOCUMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENTATION</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Management & Methodology | 5%
| Content | 35%
| Structure & Presentation | 10%

### TOTAL MARKS

100%