

DISSERTATIONS IN
**EDUCATION,
HUMANITIES,
AND THEOLOGY**

MAIJA METSÄMÄKI

*Influencing
through Language:
Studies in L2 Debate*

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND
Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology No 33



UNIVERSITY OF
EASTERN FINLAND

*Influencing through Language:
Studies in L2 Debate*

MAIJA METSÄMÄKI

*Influencing through Language:
Studies in L2 Debate*

Publications of the University of Eastern Finland
Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology
No 33

University of Eastern Finland
Joensuu
2012

Kopijyvä Oy

Joensuu, 2012

Sarjan vastaava toimittaja: Jopi Nyman

Myynti: Itä-Suomen yliopiston kirjasto

ISBN: 978-952-61-0878-0 (nid.)

ISSNL: 1798-5625

ISSN: 1798-5625

ISBN: 978-952-61-0879-7 (PDF)

ISSN: 1798-5633 (PDF)

Metsämäki, Maija Liisa
Influencing through Language: Studies in L2 Debate
Joensuu: Itä-Suomen yliopisto, 2012
Publications of the University of Eastern Finland
Dissertation in Education, Humanities, and Theology; 33
ISBN: 978-952-61-0878-0 (print)
ISSNL: 1798-5625
ISSN: 1798-5625
ISBN: 978-952-61-0879-7 (PDF)
ISSN: 1798-5633 (PDF)

ABSTRACT: INFLUENCING THROUGH LANGUAGE: STUDIES IN L2 DEBATE

This dissertation, which examines the theme of influencing through language in multinational university students' L2 debating, belongs to the field of sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, second language acquisition (SLA), pragmatics, and social semiotics. The study is based on debates video-recorded at the University of Kuopio, now part of the University of Eastern Finland, in 2006, and focuses on investigation of the use of argumentation strategies, the use of rhetorical devices, use of persuasive discourse, and multimodal/paralinguistic methods. Cross-cultural phenomena in debate situations are also examined, and Finnish and non-Finnish students are compared. The study has been conducted from the perspective of language centre teachers with the aim of contributing to the development of innovative university-level L2 instruction in oral skills at language centres in order to promote university students' L2 (= first foreign language) oral proficiency and raise their awareness of cross-cultural differences in intercultural communication.

The data of the study consist of multinational university students' (N=31) debates, which were video-recorded in a university setting. The subjects (21 Finnish, 12 non-Finnish) were students at the Department of Clinical Medicine and Nutrition, University of Kuopio. These students had reached the final stage of their two-semester university course aiming at completion of the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree. The MPH studies had covered most of the themes in the field of Public Health and had consisted of lectures, seminars, essay writing, small-group sessions, and individual presentations. The language of the MPH course had been English, which was the first foreign language for all the students. The debates analysed in this dissertation were the final task and requirement of the MPH course. The non-Finnish course leader had chosen the two topics for the debates: 1) *Restriction of alcohol under the age of eighteen encourages alcohol abuse*, and 2) *Abstinence is the best possible way to prevent HIV/AIDS*. The students, who did not know the topics of the debates before entering the video-room, had been divided into 4 groups and these groups were split into two subgroups. In each subgroup there was at least one non-Finnish student. The students were asked to act out the roles of either proponents or opponents in the debates. The

research questions were the following: 1) *What kinds of verbal and nonverbal strategies and means of argumentation do the learners use?* 2) *How do the students utilize different nonverbal means of argumentation?* and 3) *What kinds of cross-cultural phenomena are linked with the debate situation?*

The themes and features to be studied in this dissertation were investigated in three different studies. Study I examined argumentation strategies. Study II investigated multimodal/paralinguistic features, and Study III investigated the elements of persuasive discourse. In Study I, the research method was qualitative, in Study II and in Study III both qualitative and quantitative methods were used.

The results show that the students acted out their roles fairly well and were active in their argumentative roles. The most common argumentation strategies were the use of straightforward statements, evidence, statistical information, facts, examples, logical reasoning, repetition, restructuring, questions, repeated questions and use of emphatic words. The most frequently used paralinguistic tools were gestures, head nods, body movements, eye-gaze, smiling, laughter, and assertive, intonational tone of voice. In cross-cultural comparison, the Finnish students used questions and repeated questions more than the non-Finnish students did; and the non-Finnish students used more paralinguistic features than the Finnish students did. Only smiling was used more by the Finnish students. A strong collaborative strategy clearly prevailed in both proponents' and opponents' groups.

In summary, the results indicate that debating is an effective means of practising the demanding command of oral skills in various situations, and that role-plays are efficient tools for practising debating. Argumentation strategies can be taught by applying Aristotle's three devices, *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos*, and by eliciting and emphasizing the importance of paralinguistic features in oral communication. Awareness of paralinguistic means and the ways of influencing are useful and important tools and should be taught during L2 oral skills courses in university language centres. Similarly, instruction in pragmatic conversational skills should be included in the language teaching curricula.

Keywords: debating, role-play, argumentation, rhetorical skills, paralinguistic features, cross-cultural differences, awareness raising

Metsämäki, Maija Liisa
Influencing through Language: Studies in L2 Debate
Joensuu: Itä-Suomen yliopisto, 2012.
Publications of the University of Eastern Finland
Dissertation in Education, Humanities, and Theology; 33
ISBN: 978-952-61-0878-0 (nid.)
ISSNL: 1798-5625
ISSN: 1798-5625
ISBN: 978-952-61-0879-7 (PDF)
ISSN: 1798-5633 (PDF)

ABSTRAKTI: KIELELLÄ VAIKUTTAMINEN: TUTKIMUKSIA OPISKELIJOIDEN VÄITTELYISTÄ VIERAALLA KIELELLÄ

Väitöskirjassa käsitellään verbaalisia ja nonverbaalisia kielellä vaikuttamisen keinoja. Tutkimus kuuluu sosiolingvistiikan, soveltavan kielitieteen, erityisesti toisen kielen oppimisen, pragmatiikan ja sosiaalisemiotiikan alaan. Tutkimus tarkastelee vuonna 2006 videoituja englanninkielisiä väittelyitä, joissa Kuopion yliopiston (nykyisin Itä-Suomen yliopisto) kliinisen lääketieteen ja ravitsemustieteen laitoksen kansanterveystieteen maisteritutkintoon tähtäävät opiskelijat (N=33) väittelivät englannin kielellä. Tutkimus keskittyy tutkimaan sekä verbaalisia että nonverbaalisia keinoja eli argumentointistrategioiden käyttöä, retorisia keinoja, suostuttelevaa diskurssia ja paralingvistisiä/multimodaalisia vuorovaikutuksen piirteitä. Kielellisten erojen lisäksi tutkimus tarkastelee debattitilanteissa ilmeneviä kulttuurien välisiä eroja vertailemalla suomalaisten (N=21) ja ulkomaalaisten (N=12) opiskelijoiden tapoja käyttää nonverbaalisia keinoja.

Tutkimuksen tavoitteena on löytää uusia, innovatiivisia ja motivoivia opetusmenetelmiä yliopistotason vieraan kielen suullisen taidon opetukseen kielikeskuksissa, jotta suomalaiset opiskelijat kehittyisivät sekä sujuvampaan englannin kielen käyttöön että tulisivat tietoisiksi monista paralingvistisistä l. multimodaalisista keinoista, joita tämänkin tutkimuksen mukaan käytetään kansainvälisessä suullisessa viestinnässä enemmän kuin suomalaisessa suullisessa viestinnässä. Kulttuurien välisiin eroihin sekä argumentoinnissa että paralingvististen keinojen käytössä olisi myös kiinnitettävä opetuksessa enemmän huomiota. Tutkimus tähtää vieraan kielen suullisen taidon tehokkaampaan opetukseen erityisesti korkeakoulujen kielikeskuksissa.

Tutkimusaineisto kerättiin entisen Kuopion yliopiston kliinisen lääketieteen ja ravitsemustieteen laitoksella, jossa englannin kielellä toteutettu, kaksi lukukautta kestävä MPH (Master of Public Health = Kansanterveystieteen maisterikoulutus) -kurssi oli loppumassa. Kurssin aikana oli opiskeltu kaikkia kansanterveystieteen aihepiirejä luentojen, seminaarien, pienryhmäkeskustelujen, yksittäisten essee-kirjoitusten ja suullisten esitysten muodossa, ja viimeinen kurssiin kuuluva suullinen tehtävä oli videoitava debatti jostakin alan aiheesta. Kurssin opetuskieli oli englanti, joka kaikille opiskelijoille oli ensimmäinen vieras kieli. Kurssin ulkomaalainen joh-

taja oli valinnut väittelyiden aiheet: 1) *Alkoholin myynnin kieltäminen alle 18 vuotiaille johtaa alkoholin väärinkäyttöön* ja 2) *Pidättyvyys on paras ratkaisu estää HIV/AIDSin tartunta*. Opiskelijat saivat tietää ryhmänsä väittelyaiheen vasta saapuessaan videointihuoneeseen. Debattia varten opiskelijat oli jaettu kahteen ryhmään sekä edelleen kahteen alaryhmään, joten tutkimukseen osallistui 4 debattiryhmää, joissa kussakin oli puolustaja- ja vastustajaryhmä. Opiskelijat joutuivat siis olemaan joko puolustajia tai vastustajia. Tutkimuskysymykset olivat seuraavat: 1) *Millaisia kielellisiä ja ei-kielellisiä argumentointistrategioita ja -keinoja opiskelijat käyttävät?* 2) *Kuinka opiskelijat käyttävät hyväkseen erilaisia nonverbaalisia argumentointikeinoja?* ja 3) *Minkälaisia eri kulttuurieroja esiintyy debattitilanteissa?*

Tähän väitöskirjaan liittyviä teemoja ja ilmiöitä on tutkittu ja selostettu kolmessa väitöskirjan osana olevassa tutkimusartikkelissa. Artikkelit I tutkii argumentointistrategioita, artikkeli II tarkastelee paralingvistisiä/multimodaalisia ilmiöitä ja artikkeli III suostuttelevan diskurssin piirteitä. Tutkimusmenetelmä vaihtelee eri tutkimuksissa: artikkeli I:n menetelmä on kvalitatiivinen ja artikkeleissa II ja III käytetään sekä kvalitatiivista että kvantitatiivista tutkimusmenetelmää.

Tuloksista voidaan päätellä, että opiskelijat suoriutuivat rooleistaan suhteellisen hyvin ja olivat aktiivisia väittelijöitä vieraalla kielellä. Tavallisimmat argumentointistrategiat ovat suoran toteamuksen käyttö, todistusaineistoon viittaaminen, tilastotiedot, faktat, looginen todistelu, argumentointi, toistaminen, asian uudelleen rakentelu, kysymykset, kysymysten toistaminen sekä vahvojen sanojen ja ilmaisujen käyttö. Paralingvistisistä piirteistä useimmin käytettyjä ovat eleet, pään nyökkäykset, kehon liikkeet, katse, hymy, nauru sekä vakuuttava ja äänensävyiltään merkitsevä äänenkäyttö. Kulttuurienvälisiä eroja etsittäessä tutkimuksesta löytyi seuraavia eroja: suomalaiset opiskelijat käyttivät enemmän kysymyksiä ja kysymysten toistoa kuin ulkomaalaiset opiskelijat. Ulkomaalaiset opiskelijat käyttivät puolestaan enemmän paralingvistisiä keinoja kuin suomalaiset opiskelijat. Ainoastaan hymyä esiintyi useammin suomalaisilla opiskelijoilla kuin ulkomaalaisilla. Sekä puolustajien että vastustajien ryhmässä vallitsi selvästi kollaboratiivisuus ja yhteinen yrittäminen.

Yhteenvedon tulosten perusteella todetaan, että väittelemineen on tehokas keino harjoitella vaativia vieraan kielen suullisen kielitaidon tilanneharjoituksia. Roolileikit ovat myös tehokkaita debatin harjoitusmuotoja. Kielellä vaikuttamista voidaan harjoitella opettamalla Aristoteleen kolme retoriikan keinoa: *ethos*, *logos*, ja *pathos* ja soveltamalla niitä suullisen viestinnän harjoituksiin. Tietoisuus paralingvististen/multimodaalisten keinojen tärkeydestä suullisessa viestinnässä auttaa saavuttamaan paremmat ja aidommat tulokset.

Avainsanat: väittelemineen englannin kielellä, roolipelit, retoriset taidot, paralingvistiset/multimodaaliset/ei-kielelliset keinot, kulttuurienväliset erot, tietoisuuden lisääminen

Acknowledgements

This research began as a Pilot Study in the 1980s while I was working as Senior Lecturer of English and Head of the Language Centre at the University of Kuopio. The initial purpose of my study was to investigate what the students' main problems in English oral communication were and to expand this investigation into a Licentiate Thesis. As a postgraduate student I took part in the research seminars of the English Department of the University of Jyväskylä under the guidance of the late Professor Kari Sajavaara. Due to traumatic losses in my family, there was a long pause in my research work.

In 2006, I had a new opportunity to continue the non-finished study, this time with the aim of completing the study in the form of a doctoral dissertation. I needed new empirical data and knew that there were English course modules for the international students at the university. I turned to Professor Jussi Kauhanen from the Department of the Clinical Medicine and Nutrition of the University of Kuopio. He was very cooperative and arranged the opportunity for me to video-record the English debates in the seminar sessions of the multinational Master's Degree students of Public Health Science in his department. I thank Jussi, who kindly arranged me this opportunity. I am also indebted to the group of the Public Health students who took part in this study by playing the roles of proponents and opponents in the debates.

My supervisor at the time was Professor Arja Piirainen-Marsh at the English Department of the University of Jyväskylä. I want to thank Arja for her encouraging and supportive guidance. After a long pause, I needed advice and encouragement to continue upon the path of a researcher; Arja's patience and wise advice helped me restart the study.

Professor Eero Tarasti from the University of Helsinki has been a very important person during this research project. He kindly invited me to join the group of semioticians in Imatra, where I participated in the work of the Network University of IASS-IAS and gave papers in the World Congresses in Helsinki/Imatra (2007) and in La Coruna, Spain (2009). My warmest thanks to Eero for his valuable support and encouragement.

Professor Juhani Laurinkari, a very active and tireless editor of publications at the University of Eastern Finland, kindly provided me the opportunity to publish two articles in his books. I thank Juhani warmly for his kind cooperation.

In 2010, with the fusion of the Kuopio and Joensuu Universities into the University of Eastern Finland, a new chance to continue my doctoral studies at the Philosophical Faculty of this university opened to me. Professor Jopi Nyman has been my supervisor since then, and I thank him for his valuable help and advice in leading me to the end of this project. Professor Vilma Hänninen, my other supervisor, has provided very useful advice and instructions, mainly on issues in the domain of social psychology and sociolinguistics, and I thank her warmly for her advice and kind cooperation.

I also thank my pre-examiners Professor Päivi Pietilä from the University of Turku and University Lecturer Dr Leena Kuure from the University of Oulu for their detailed comments and advice and Päivi for agreeing to act as the opponent at my defence. Thanks also to my previous colleague, University Lecturer Joann von Weissenberg, PhD, who revised the language of dissertation for me and with whom I have had many fruitful discussions.

The Library of the University of Eastern Finland has been very helpful and I appreciate their valuable help and thank the librarians for their kindness during the final solitary phases of my work.

Finally, I want to thank my family members for their patience and for many interesting discussions concerning various aspects of my study. My grateful thoughts also go to my late husband Tapio, with whom, during our long marriage, I had vivid and interesting discussions and debates about oral communication, dialects, influencing, persuasion, and power.

Kuopio, August 2012

Maija Metsämäki

Contents

ABSTRACT	v
ABSTRAKTI	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
CONTENTS	xi
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 General Topic	1
1.2 Aims of the Thesis	3
1.3 Structure of the Thesis	4
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	5
2.1 Overview of Second Language Acquisition Research	5
2.2 Oral Skills and Communicative Competence	7
2.3 L2 Teaching at the University Level	10
2.4 Aspects of Debate	11
2.4.1 Discourse and Power	14
2.4.2 Rhetoric and Persuasion	15
2.4.3 Audience/Listeners/Opponents	16
2.5 Multimodal/paralinguistic Features in Interaction	17
3 METHOD	20
3.1 Pilot Study	20
3.2 Data Collection	21
3.3 Analysis of the Debates	22
4 INDIVIDUAL STUDIES	24
4.1 Study I	24
4.2 Study II	25
4.3 Study III	27
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	29
BIBLIOGRAPHY	32
ARTICLES	39

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

This dissertation is based on the following studies:

- I Metsämäki, M. (2009). Influencing through Language – University Students' Argumentation Strategies. *AFinLA-e* 1: 61-76.
- II Metsämäki, M. (2011). Paralinguistic Means and Their Role in University Students' L2 Debate. *Lingua Americana* 29 (December 2011): 39-61.
- III Metsämäki, M. (2012) Persuasive Discourse in EFL Debate. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2 (February 2012): 205-213.

The original articles are reprinted with the permission of the copyright holders.

1 Introduction

1.1 GENERAL TOPIC

This dissertation dealing with the theme of *Influencing through language* reports on a research project concerned with university students' oral proficiency in the first foreign language, which in over 90 % of all comprehensive-school, upper-secondary-school, and university-level students in Finland is English. The empirical data of the study, the video-recorded debates, were recorded at the University of Kuopio in spring 2006 with a group of multinational university students. In 2010, the universities of Kuopio and Joensuu were merged and now form the University of Eastern Finland.

This study belongs to the field of applied linguistics, second language acquisition (SLA), pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and social semiotics. In recent years, communication has become a favourite topic of discussion in many domains of society. This is mainly due to increased globalization, which affects communication not only in the academic world, but also in governmental and non-governmental sectors of life, business and industrial settings, and the media (Fairclough 2006). In these contexts, communication is almost always implemented in English, which has become the most frequently used language, the lingua franca, in the western world and beyond (Jenkins 2007; Mauranen 2010). Similarly, research on communication has increased, and it is clear that the teaching of cross-cultural awareness, in the rapidly globalising world in particular, should be increased. International exchange programmes at universities have added to the need for language studies and for increased awareness of intercultural differences. Moreover, there has recently been growing worldwide interest in SLA studies and in the importance of discursive language learning and teaching in the world (cf. Young 2009).

The impetus for this research project stems from my practical work in teaching as an English lecturer at the Language Centre of the former University of Kuopio. Amazed at and worried over the students' limited speaking skills in English, I wanted to ascertain the reasons for the worrying situation, and in order to improve it, locate new methods for modern, challenging L2 oral skills teaching in order to improve the situation. After many trials and efforts I found that the students have to be provided with a very clearly defined task, e.g. a simulated role-play, to get them interested in and committed to a task, and for them to attempt to carry out their roles in the game.

This proved to be a suitable and sufficiently inspiring task for my purposes.

In order to achieve success in influencing discourse, many factors, viz. correct word choice, persuasive and assertive speech style, and use of appropriate multimodal features have to be kept in mind. The speaker has to be aware of the main principles of rhetorical discourse based on Aristotle's principles of ethos, pathos and logos (Aristotle 1997). Nonverbal or multimodal features are essential for the success of all communication, particularly so, if the genre of the speech is persuasive (Haddington & Käätä 2011). These themes are investigated in the theoretical section of this dissertation (Sections 2.1-2.5) and in the original articles.

To investigate the issue, a formal experiment was set up in spring 2006, and the results are reported in the research articles. A debating session was arranged for a multinational group of students (N=33, N=21 Finnish students, N=12 non-Finnish students). The debating was planned to be an obligatory part of these MPH (Master of Public Health) students' course. The language of the course had been English and all students were advanced or upper intermediate level speakers of English. Topics for the debates were chosen by the non-Finnish course leader on the basis of the themes studied during the two-semester course. Based on the video-recorded debates, the following research themes opened up for the analysis of the debates: the students' argumentation skills and strategies, their collaboration in small groups, features of persuasive speech and their use of paralinguistic means during the debates. Cross-cultural differences in the use of these issues were also studied.

The above themes are investigated in the articles forming this dissertation, and the research questions deal with the students' strategies in performing their roles in verbal and nonverbal interaction during the debates. Each article has its own research questions and results. The general concern of the research questions is how well the students cope in the debates and what kinds of argumentation, persuasion, and multimodal strategies are available to them during the debates. The results indicate that in their argumentation during these debates, the students resorted to repetition, repeated questions and arguments, restructuring, and rephrasing. They succeeded fairly well in their demanding tasks, and collaborative strategies contributed to ensure their success. The use of paralinguistic tools, e.g. gaze, smiling, laughter, voice, and gestures, was very important in building up the interactional atmosphere of the debates. The use of paralinguistic means by Finnish and non-Finnish students was studied, and the results indicate that Finnish students do not use paralinguistic features in their speech as actively as their foreign peers do.

The main objective of this research project was to answer the following research questions:

1. What kinds of verbal and nonverbal strategies and types of argumentation do the learners use?
2. How do the students utilize different types of argumentation?
3. What kinds of cross-cultural phenomena are linked with the debate situation?

What further motivates this study from a cross-cultural perspective is that the Finnish speech culture differs considerably from many other cultures in the world, as the Finns are known to be silent, reserved, slow to respond, and reticent (Lehtonen &

Sajavaara 1983; Sallinen-Kuparinen 1986). Communication research often starts from the perspective of national culture when addressing “intercultural, cross-cultural and international communication themes” (Wilkins & Isotalus 2009: 2). Infocentrism (*Fi. asiasta puhuminen*) has been revealed to be central to the Finnish way of speaking (Wilkins 2009: 63). As Wilkins puts it, “Terms for talk are a fundamental aspect of the communicative means of sociocultural life. They reveal the very basic categories for communicative activity within the speech community” (Wilkins 2009: 66). Finnish speakers often give a very taciturn and impolite impression to foreign visitors, although their intention is to behave normally. Therefore, awareness of cultural differences and the importance of the existence of paralinguistic features is very important for all who come into contact with foreigners. From this perspective, being well aware of the Finnish students’ typical communication behaviour, I wanted to study the issue and plan for them a motivating task in which they would be able to apply the infocentric style of speaking in their debating roles. Arguing, agreeing, and disagreeing are easier in a debate in which the background information has been studied beforehand. This was the case in this project, because the themes of the debates were based on themes studied during the course.

1.2 AIMS OF THE THESIS

This thesis originates from the need to locate new innovative ideas and means for university-level oral skills courses in English and by means of these new stimulating methods to promote EFL university-level oral skills teaching in university language centres and encourage the Finnish students to overcome their limitations. A pilot study, which had been the first effort for this project, will be examined in Chapter 3.1.

For the implementation of this project, I wanted to plan a test which would show how well the university students would cope in a challenging communicative situation. Debating is a very demanding skill, even in one’s mother tongue, but to perform it in a foreign language is even more demanding.

The research articles in this thesis explore the issue from various perspectives. One of the aims of the study was to reveal the problems that students face when communicating in a foreign language and also to find solutions to these problems (Study I). Another aim was to study persuasive discourse. Persuasive discourse is closely connected with debating and argumentative discourse, and accordingly, persuasion and small group behaviour, as well as the characteristics of rhetorical discourse, were investigated in Study III. Multimodal or paralinguistic features are among the basic elements of discourse. It is very important to be aware of nonverbal aspects of discourse. Students should learn to interpret and use them in their intercultural communication. Paralinguistic features pertinent to persuasive discourse are dealt with in Study II.

1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

This thesis begins with an introduction to the general topic of the study, *Influencing through Language*. The purpose here is to investigate multinational university students' interactional behaviour and argumentation strategies in debate situations. The second chapter seeks to provide a framework for the study, and the history of research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) will be presented briefly as a background.

Oral skills, one of the main themes of this dissertation, is dealt with in Chapter 2.2. In this section L2 teaching at schools in Finland is discussed, in particular the fact that, because there is no test in L2 speaking in the school-leaving test or matriculation examination, teaching of oral skills tends to be neglected at schools. In addition, L2 teaching at the university level is discussed in this section (2.3). Section 2.4 will study the genre of debating (2.4) and its use as a teaching method at schools and at universities. The context of power is closely related to the theme of discourse. The interrelationship between power and discourse is studied in 2.4.1. This section will also address rhetoric. Discursive influencing is an important topic to be dealt with in this context. Section 2.4.3 will deal with the issue of audience – listeners and opponents – as their role is very important in debating. Section 2.5 will deal with multimodal features in interaction to the extent that they are relevant to the study of debating.

Chapter 3 deals with research methods, beginning by describing the pilot study (3.1), which consisted of simulated role-plays and was implemented at the former University of Kuopio with students from four faculties in their future roles and with native speakers of English as their clients or patients. Section 3.2 explains in detail the research method, data collection, and methods of analysis. Section 3.3 addresses the analysis of the debates and the results of the study.

Chapter 4 presents each individual research article (I-III) by summarizing the main points and presenting the results based on the studies. Chapter 5 draws together the conclusions and discusses potential future research topics.

2 *Theoretical Framework*

This chapter introduces the theoretical framework of the thesis, beginning with an overview of the history of research into second language learning and teaching. This will be followed with a discussion of oral skills and the teaching of foreign languages in Finland. I will also address the debate and its contexts, and the role of paralinguistic features in interaction.

2.1 OVERVIEW OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION RESEARCH

Second language acquisition (SLA) is a term that refers to the process of acquiring or learning a new language after learning one's first language, the mother tongue (Krashen 1987: vii). Stephen Krashen, a pioneer in research on second language acquisition, crystallized the main core of his theory in the following short sentence: "We acquire language in an amazingly simple way – when we understand the messages" (Krashen 1987: vii). According to him, the following two prerequisites are important in the process: real messages must be comprehended (comprehensible input) and the acquirer must not be 'on the defensive', i.e. he/she must have a positive attitude towards the learning event (1987: 2).

Krashen has also presented a more formal distinction between second language acquisition and second language learning: the term acquisition is used to refer to the gradual, mostly subconscious development of ability in language by using it naturally in communicative situations, while the term learning applies to a more conscious process of accumulating knowledge of the features, such as vocabulary and grammar, of a language (2009: 10). According to Krashen (2009: 89), the role of grammar in language teaching is not of utmost importance although study of the structure of a language gives background for the study. This distinction between acquisition and learning is the most fundamental of all the hypotheses in Krashen's theory (2009: 9-10). For Krashen, language acquisition is a slow process (2009: 7).

Krashen's (2009) theory of second language acquisition consists of five different hypotheses illustrating various aspects of language learning and acquisition. He himself called one of them the input theory, his favourite theory. The other four hypotheses are the acquisition – learning distinction, the natural order hypothesis, the

monitor hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis (Krashen 2009: 10-32). The affective filter hypothesis introduces Krashen's (2009) view that a number of affective variables, such as motivation, self-confidence and anxiety, contribute positively to second language acquisition. According to Krashen (2009: 30-32), such learners are more receptive to learning: if the learner's motivation and self-esteem are low, the "affective filter" prevents them from learning. The affective filter hypothesis is particularly important in adult education and should be taken into account when language courses are planned for adults. Krashen's model was influential in the field of SLA and also had a great influence on language teaching.

The academic discipline of second language acquisition, a sub-discipline of applied linguistics, is closely related to psychology, cognitive psychology, and education, and it can be researched from different perspectives including cognitive, social, and sociocultural ones (Alanen 2011). All of these approaches are applied in this study. SLA research began as an interdisciplinary field in the mid-1960s. In particular, two publications are seen as instrumental to development of the modern study of SLA, viz. S. Pit Corder's essay "The Significance of Learners' Errors" (1967) and Larry Selinker's article "Interlanguage" (1972). Corder was interested in the question of whether L1 and L2 learners use the same processes and proposed that "humans are born with an innate predisposition to acquire language, and if we do use the mechanism for L1 acquisition, it will be available for L2 acquisition. The main difference is one of motivation" (Corder 1967: 166). Selinker coined the term "interlanguage" and in his article (1972) he argued that second language learners' linguistic systems do not depend on the first or the second language. Interlanguage is an in-between system with elements from the L1 and L2, but it also has its own rules (Yule 2006: 167).

The introduction of sociocultural theory in SLA research occurred in the 1990s (Lantolf & Thorne 2006). In the introduction of their theory, Lantolf and Thorne (2006) emphasize the role of Vygotsky and his psycholinguistic approach. According to them, Vygotsky's view of the linguistic sign resembles that of de Saussure: it has "both an indicative and a symbolic function, with the former predominating in the early stages of ontogenesis, and the latter coming to the fore in later development" (Lantolf & Thorne 2006: 17). Socio-cultural approaches to SLA appear to be linked with pragmatics and its attempts to recognize the meaning of the speakers' utterances. The term pragmatics was coined and defined by Morris in 1938 (Levinson 1985: 5; Schiffrin 1994: 191), and was first considered to be a branch of semiotics. According to Levinson, "Pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding" (1985: 21). Levinson, concerned with the distinction between sentence and utterance, also proposed the definition that "semantics is concerned with sentence-meaning, and pragmatics with utterance-meaning" (1985: 19). The contemporary version of pragmatics focuses on the meaning in context (Nikula 2000). Yule suggests that pragmatics studies "invisible' meaning," i.e. "what is meant even when it isn't actually said or written" (Yule 2006: 112). Furthermore, pragmatics is a study of how linguistic forms are arranged in sequence. In intercultural encounters, awareness of cross-cultural pragmatic differences is important, and it is one of the main tasks of university L2 language teachers to include these aspects in their curricula.

One of the most important phenomena in second language acquisition is language transfer, which refers to the influence of the learner's mother tongue on acquisition of a second language (Odlin 1989: 12-13). The phenomenon has also been called cross-linguistic influence in language learning. The term "interference" was previously used to refer to all forms of transfer (Odlin 1989: 12). The first SLA scholar with an interest in transfer was Robert Lado (1957), who sought to discuss language learning in a behaviourist light and pay attention to the impact of the mother tongue on L2 learners (Meriläinen 2010: 8). One of the recent studies on language transfer in Finland was conducted by Meriläinen (2010), who examined patterns of lexical and syntactic transfer in Finnish students' written English between 1990 and 2005. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) have done research on cross-linguistic influence in language and cognition. According to them, transfer effects go beyond phonological or morphological structures and syntax, as they "extend to the meanings and functions that language users associate with those forms, as can be seen, for example, in differences between English speakers and Spanish speaking learners of English" (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 12). One of the recent contributions of Jarvis and Pavlenko is a new type of transfer in which the languages that a person knows can interact with one another (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 13).

The pilot study (see Chapter 3.1) started with the idea of searching for errors and breakdowns in students' oral communication. The aim of the study was to find ways to improve language instruction and to help the students when communication broke down. Communication strategies were a popular topic of research in the 1980s, and my study was based on the theories of Tarone (1980), Riley (1980), and Faerch and Kasper (1983), seeking to analyse the informative and persuasive strategies used. The material was used later for teaching purposes, and the students found it motivating to listen to interviews recorded by students from their own field.

The studies (I-III) reported in this dissertation seek to discuss oral communication from various perspectives that clarify the role of language in influencing discourse.

2.2 ORAL SKILLS AND COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

The present study deals with the L2 oral proficiency of multinational university students in role-plays in an institutional setting. Before providing an outline of language teaching and studies at the university level in Chapter 2.3, I will first present an overview of L2 teaching and language studies in Finnish comprehensive schools, and upper levels of secondary schools, and describe the matriculation examination.

While many languages have been taught in Finnish schools for decades, the first foreign language for most schoolchildren since the 1950s has been English. Many schools offer students the option of choosing another language as the first foreign language, but there is little interest in other languages. English has become the 'global language', 'the universal language', English as a lingua franca (ELF); and because students can read English and hear it everywhere from the media to the Internet, it has become the common language for everybody. In academic life ELF is the most obvious choice for students, for instance: English is the second language for most uni-

versity students and therefore they can manage in their exchange universities with other international students. Mauranen's (2010) corpus-based study of the features of English as a lingua franca in academia shows a similar use of many features, such as repetition, rephrasing, and repairs, as were also noted in the debates of this study (2010: 16-18).

However, due to limited financial resources, and to course timetables and arrangements, the number of other foreign languages available at universities has recently been limited. The language skills of Finnish school-leavers also include only the compulsory other official language of the country (Finnish/Swedish) and one foreign language, in most cases English (Lukiolaki/Upper Secondary School Act 629/1998; Valtioneuvoston asetus lukiokoulutuksen yleisistä valtakunnallisista tavoitteista ja tuntijaosta/Government Decree on the General National Aims and Division of Teaching Hours at the Upper Secondary School 955/2002). In any case, when students begin their studies at university, they have studied the compulsory L2 language, most frequently English, at least 10 years at school.

The Finnish Matriculation Examination is an external examination, administered, organised, and executed simultaneously in all upper secondary schools two times a year, in spring and in autumn, by the Matriculation Examination Board appointed by the Ministry of Education (Laki ylioppilastutkinnon järjestämisestä/Act on the Organization of the Matriculation Examination 672/2005; Valtioneuvoston asetus ylioppilastutkinnosta/Government Decree on the Matriculation Examination 915/2005). The board consists of teachers, university professors, and lecturers from all parts of the country. The test candidates are obliged to take examinations in four subjects and, in addition, they have a choice of three additional subjects. The compulsory subjects include mother tongue (Finnish or Swedish), the first foreign language (usually English), mathematics, and the sciences and/or humanities (Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta 2006: 1-2). If the candidate fails any of these tests (ca. 5.73 % in spring 2012), s/he can have another try in that subject the following autumn/spring. In spring 2011 the number of candidates taking part in the Matriculation Examination was 30,782, whereas the number of candidates taking part in English as the first foreign language was 16,490 (www.ylioppilastutkinnot.fi). Since it is currently possible to split the examination into parts and take the compulsory language test in autumn while still at school, the numbers do not give a correct picture of the candidates and their success in the tests.

The matriculation examination for English contains a reading comprehension test with questions based on the content of a text, a listening comprehension test, a test of grammatical structures, and an essay-writing test. It is possible to take a voluntary speaking test, for which students receive a separate certificate based on the result; but very few students take it. It is general knowledge amongst teachers that teaching is aimed at the issues that will be tested in the final test. Speaking is not tested in the final examination; and because there are a variety of other important topics to be practised during the courses, practising of speaking skills tends to be neglected.

Takala (2004) has done versatile research on the history of oral skills teaching and testing. As a member of the Matriculation Examination Board in Finland, he has written about the need to develop the oral test for the first foreign language. He has

also made suggestions for implementation of the test and discussed the importance of the relationship between teaching and testing. If there were an oral test in the Matriculation Examination, the teachers would have to bring an abundance of oral exercises and practice into the classroom (Takala 2004: 255-275), which would be likely to improve the students' communication skills.

One of the main aims of teaching foreign-language oral skills is to motivate learners to achieve communicative competence during their L2 studies. Canale and Swain (1980) were the first researchers to use this term, and in their view communicative competence consists of three skills: 1) grammatical competence, 2) sociolinguistic competence, and 3) strategic competence. A fourth component, 4) discourse competence, was added to the list by Canale (1983: 9). An updated model has been developed by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995). Their "pedagogically motivated model with content specifications" consists of 5 components: 1) discourse competence, 2) linguistic competence, 3) actional competence, 4) socio-cultural competence, and 5) a strategic component (1995: 10-11). To boost communicative competence, L2 teaching at language centres in particular aims to achieve such a level of written and oral skills that students will be able to cope well in future tasks in their own field.

The issue of communicative competence has also been studied from various perspectives. In Finland, Pietilä has carried out versatile research in the field of SLA teaching and testing. Like Kasper (1982) and Riley (1980, 1989), she has studied communicative competence and various aspects of pragmatic speech and pragmatic errors (Pietilä 1999, 2001, 2003, 2004). Riley has studied pragmatic errors and has given the following definition: "pragmalinguistic error results from a failure to identify or express *meanings* correctly, sociopragmatic error is the result of a failure to identify the *situation* correctly" (Riley 1989: 235). Both types of error make intercultural communication more complicated for learners of language and culture. Riley has emphasized the distinction between language-specific and culture-specific rules and norms (1989: 235). General models do not seem to guarantee unproblematic communication. There have been attempts to follow Grice's (1975) maxims of conversation to formulate universals in language use, but without significant success (Pohl 2004). Brown and Levinson (1987, cited in Spencer-Oatey 2000: 13) propose the concept of face as a universal human need and the key to politeness and rapport management. The pragmatics of politeness and face has been studied by Piirainen-Marsh (1995). According to her, conflict can be avoided through language by choosing the right strategy for the situation (1995: 25). In debating, avoidance of conflict is particularly important, and the debaters should be aware of the face-threatening elements in speech. For example, a participant who uses too assertive a tone of voice in debating may risk offending their counterpart (Study II).

The importance of the socio-linguistic dimension of language studies has been emphasized in research (Corder 1982). It is also seen in the guidelines given for the teaching of pragmalinguistics and pragmatic competence in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe 2001), the common basis for the elaboration of language syllabi, curriculum guidelines, examinations, and textbooks across Europe, which provides a description of what language learners should know and what skills they need to master to be effective users of language.

The importance of awareness of pragmatic speech and pragmatic errors should be emphasized to students, and this theme could be included in the course material for oral skills courses. Pietilä (2004: 215-219) suggests that learners' awareness of cross-cultural conversational phenomena should be explicitly addressed when teaching conversational skills. Pietilä (2004: 218-219) also mentions that the teaching of oral skills should aim at lessening communicative anxiety by creating a positive atmosphere in the classroom. My personal experience and the results of this research also suggest that practising oral communication in simulations and role-plays can create a positive atmosphere. Similarly, these exercises could add to students' awareness of conversational phenomena. Argumentation and debating could also be part of syllabus for the oral skills courses. The pedagogical benefit of debate exercises as a form of learning in various fields would give useful impetus for further research.

2.3 L2 TEACHING AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL

According to the Bologna Declaration (1999), the European countries seek to harmonize their higher education by increasing comparability and shared practices (www.enqa.eu/bologna_overview). In Finland, regardless of which subject the students are studying at university level, they currently have to take obligatory language tests in two languages, one in the first foreign language and the second in the other official national language, in either Swedish or Finnish, depending on their mother tongue. In all universities, the Language Centre is in charge of organising the compulsory language courses and tests. The aim of language teaching at the language centres is to provide students with the necessary reading skills to enable them to cope with the academic texts of their own field. The aim of oral skills courses is to provide students with the skills necessary to cope in international encounters, seminars and meetings. Depending on the financial resources of the university, courses in other languages are offered. The oral courses do not, however, give students the necessary proficiency, because these courses are too short. The aim of the research project dealt with in this dissertation was to locate new innovative ideas for the teaching of oral skills courses at the university level.

University language centres have been in charge of organising compulsory language teaching and tests in all universities in Finland since the mid-1970s. In the early phases, teaching had two purposes: first, it aimed to provide students with necessary reading skills, i.e. to learn to read the texts of their own academic field. These courses were called ESP (English for Specific Purposes) courses. At the end of the course there was a reading comprehension test. The second purpose was to provide students with the oral skills needed in their field. This course sometimes also included a listening component with interesting programmes for listening comprehension. Oral skills courses tended to offer academic oral skills teaching with the aim of enabling students to manage in international seminars and workshops in their own field. Based on the Bologna Declaration, university language centre courses were restructured in 2007. The new English modules integrate the four language skills and, after an introduction to academic reading, writing, speaking, and presentation skills in Module

1, the students continue to deepen and practise the same skills in Modules 2 and 3 (Stotesbury 2007: 40).

While language centres teach general and academic language skills to all university students, those who study English as an academic subject do so in specialized English departments. In the English departments, students study to become teachers and other experts in English. The background of these students is not the same as that of the students at the language centres. The former have in many cases spent a few months in an English-speaking country and their oral proficiency is often better than that of other university students. Pietilä has conducted research on the oral proficiency of students of English at university level and reports that the students complain of lack of practice in oral skills at the university (Pietilä 1999: 13). On the whole, practising speaking skills has played a minor role in the teaching of foreign languages both in secondary schools and at universities in Finland, and the effects of this extend beyond the university level (Pietilä 1999: 71).

During my teaching career, the best teaching experiences with extensive positive feedback have come from so-called *Cross-cultural seminars*. These were meant for students of all disciplines, but in particular for the foreign exchange students of the university. After an introduction to cultural studies and intercultural differences, the participants were given the task of preparing oral presentations dealing with some cultural features, manners or customs typical of their own cultures. After the presentation, there was a lively discussion in which most participants participated actively.

According to research results, innovative practices in course planning and management are fruitful. The effect of the role of the L2 learning context has been investigated by Serrano et al. (2011) among three groups of Spanish university students. While one group of students spent some time on an Erasmus scholarship in the United Kingdom, two groups were studying in two different types of intensive courses in Spain, one in an "intensive" group and the other in a "semi-intensive" group. The study aimed at comparing students' performance after their participation in the programmes and their written and oral performances were tested after the courses. The results indicate that the least advantageous context was the "at home semi-intensive course," and that the written and oral performances of the group that had studied in Britain and the one participating in an intensive course at home were similar. According to these results, the context of learning affects the development of L2 learning (Serrano et al. 2011: 140).

2.4 ASPECTS OF DEBATE

In L2 university-level teaching for advanced students in the language centres, the aim is to concentrate on content-based course material and familiarize students with the special language of their own academic field and future profession. Debating has been used mainly in L1 oral-skills courses, and in some upper secondary schools in Finland, competitive debates are organized yearly to arouse the interest of students in a given issue. Debating and argumentation are not easy forms of oral language use, particularly if the contexts have not been taught and practised during the courses. As

stated previously, I decided to use debates as research material in my study, because I had learnt that clearly defined tasks to be implemented by university students in given roles would activate the students and prove useful for the study. On the basis of this experience and my previous studies, debating was chosen as a way of approaching students' use of persuasive language.

In debating, interaction is based on arguing and protesting. Moreover, debate is a very old form of communication with specific characteristics. For example, a debate has to have a goal. Typically, it has an internal structure, including the following: 1) a set of assumptions or premises, 2) a method of reasoning or deduction, and 3) a conclusion or final point. Furthermore, intellectual and logical reasoning is emphasized in debating (Ylikoski 1987: 81). Historically, debating has long traditions in Asian cultures, in Rome and Athens, as also seen in the rhetorical principles created by Aristotle in 384-322 B.C. (see Aristotle 1997). In a debate, two contradictory positions are stated; the participants try to find logical arguments for and against these arguments and be the most convincing. Aristotle (1926) divided the rhetoric of debate into three parts: 1) political, 2) judicial, and 3) representational. Political speeches deal with the measures which should be implemented or omitted in the future. Judicial speeches aim at clarifying the truth in measures which have been carried out in the past. Explanatory speeches concentrate on praising or accusing a person or dealing with a current topic. Debate is assertive interaction between two parties holding different (affirmative and negative) views on a given topic (Ylikoski 1987).

In this genre of communication, argumentation and skill in presenting evidence and facts are emphasized. While the two opposing parties try to argue and find a solution, a compromise is never the aim of arguing (Ylikoski 1987: 83). Debating is a difficult genre of communication, especially when implemented in a foreign language. At schools, debating is practised in the courses of certain subjects (e.g. history and mother tongue). The number of participants in a debate may vary. It may consist of two persons or two groups, or they may be one person debating against a group. The main idea is that the parties are either 'for' (pro) or 'against' (con) the theme given. There may be also a moderator acting as a chair, but sometimes the debate is led without any leader. The most common type of debate deals with opinions or beliefs (Kakkuri-Knuuttila & Halonen 2007).

Argument is used as a form of communication in which problems are solved by negotiating and which as an educational form of discourse trains the students to analyse problems, to create a logical frame to the debates, to argue and to support the speaker's own beliefs and opinions against the opponent (Ylikoski 1987). Argumentation skills and the ability to give reasons and evidence are emphasized in debating. Schiffrin (1985) uses the terms 'rhetorical' and 'oppositional' to describe argumentation. In debating, the two parties, the proponents and the opponents, are interacting, as they try to find a solution to the problem. Hutchby (1996: 21) suggests that it is important to look at the ways in which arguments are made and the ways in which the opponents react to them. Argumentation skills are important, and furthermore, they are useful in the academic context. Studies show that argumentation courses are beneficial for students' critical thinking (Colbert 1995), oral proficiency (Goodwin 2003), and self-confidence (Pan 2010).

Research on Finnish speech culture reveals that an important function of discussion in Finnish culture is to maintain harmony (Sallinen-Kuparinen 1986). The American scholar Donal Carbaugh (1995) has also noted that in Finnish culture it is desirable to avoid themes that are “contentious or conflictual” (1995: 55). Thus, Finnish communication culture seems to promote a policy of consensus, and courses of debating and argumentation are not widely included in school curricula. Due to this cultural aspect, it is important to try to design new innovative curricula and include argumentation and debate instruction in foreign language courses. In the globalising world, there is a growing demand for highly proficient speakers of foreign languages, particularly speakers of English.

At the school level, debating could be practised as a collaborative project by combining e.g. mother tongue or history and the foreign language course. In other words, the students would already have the skills in the subject matter and they could use these skills in the foreign language debating. Skills of argumentation and debating are useful and can be applied in many academic fields. Argumentation enhances other subjects and has been applied, e.g. as mini-debate material for academic courses (cf. Slater 2009). In science education, reformers argue that successful approaches should make it possible for learners to “know, use, and interpret scientific explanations of the natural world,” to “generate and evaluate scientific evidence and explanations,” and “to participate productively in scientific practices and discourse” (Duschl et al. as quoted in Slater 2010: 425). According to Slater, the skills needed for scientific discourse do not develop naturally unless they are taught explicitly. As Slater suggests (2010: 425-426), to assist students in learning to think scientifically, they could be given mini-debates for analysis.

Argumentation has been used as a teaching and learning tool. Simonneaux (2001) has compared the benefits of role-play and conventional discussion to teaching an issue concerning transgenesis. The students had to decide whether or not to approve the founding of a transgenic salmon farm, and they were told to argue their case well. The project was carefully planned and various aspects of the issue were explained to the students: economic, political, ecological, and human health. The results show that many students changed their minds after receiving exact information on the issue. The main problem was the science teachers’ lack of familiarity with the conventions of role-play. Simonneaux (2001: 925) concludes that classroom debates are fruitful in promoting student participation in discussions on science, which shows the usefulness of role-play as a teaching tool.

Several studies have reported positive experiences in the use of argumentation. Simon et al. (2006) conducted a project in greater London where 12 science teachers from secondary schools took part in a series of workshops on preparing material for the teaching of argumentation in. As a result the teachers received a set of materials and pedagogic strategies and developed their argumentation skills. The meetings were a basis for further development, and a change of practices followed in two-thirds of the groups. Similarly, Gregory and Holloway (2005) obtained positive results from the use of debate in their project with social work students in which debate was used as a pedagogic tool. They argue that, to become effective practitioners, students need “a complex interplay of knowledge, skills and values” (Gregory & Holloway 2005: 617).

After participating in reflective learning based on debates the students maintained that both their understanding and their confidence in their argumentation skills had increased (Gregory & Holloway 2005: 626-633). Finally, in her study on students' voices in academic debate, Bartanen (1995) suggests that women and men students should be listened to equally and they should be enhanced in academic debate. From a feminist perspective, Bartanen (1995) shows how students' collaboration with teachers when preparing for debates may promote the creation of equity for women and men in the classroom.

2.4.1 Discourse and Power

Studies of debating show that the use of language is linked with power. According to the old proverb, 'the one who speaks, uses power'. Rousseau stated in the 18th century: "The strongest man is never strong enough always to be master unless he transforms his power into right and obedience into duty" (quoted in Wareing 2004: 10). The status of some languages compared to the others, such as that of English, shows how language and power are interrelated (Wareing 2004: 10-15).

In the late 1970s several linguists and conversation analysts became interested in power as manifested in language and discourse. The first question was 'Who or what gives power to the speaker?' According to the first theorists, power was mainly given by gender, age, socioeconomic status, and expert knowledge. Social scientists made a simple division into two categories: the power given by the status and the power given by personal qualifications. Sometimes power is taken for granted, which is often the case in political discourse. According to Lakoff (1975), "Language is politics, politics assigns power, power governs how people talk and how they are understood. The analysis of language from this point of view is more than an academic exercise: today, more than ever it is a survival skill" (1975: 7). In Thornborrow's view (2002), talk as such is "a powerful phenomenon": "some particular types of discursive actions [...] have been considered to be more powerful than others" (Thornborrow 2002: 7). According to Thornborrow (2002: 7), language and discourse are important sites where power relations are carved out and sustained.

Although the primary focus in the studies reported in this thesis is on speech and interaction as seen in debates and less on the institutional aspects, these aspects need to be addressed. Pierre Bourdieu (1991) has written about symbolic power, which can be exercised only if it is recognized and created by the power of words and slogans. In earlier studies, power was mostly understood and illustrated as being one-way domination and mastery by one speaker or institution. In Habermas's (1984: 284-285) view, institutions aim at success and goals and are involved in strategic action which he distinguishes from communicative action. Thornborrow describes Habermas's idea in the following manner: "Strategic discourse is [...] power laden and goal-directed, while communicative discourse, in its ideal manifestation, is about speakers symmetrically engaging in achieving mutual understanding" (2002: 2). Institutional talk has been described as "characteristically asymmetrical" (Drew and Heritage 1992: 47), where asymmetry "is much less a question of turn distribution between participants

and much more one of unequal distribution of social power and status” (Thornborrow 2002: 3).

Power as an element in language use is central to the topic of this thesis, debating. In debating, both proponents and opponents have the opportunity to use assertive power in their logical turns, to choose the right tone of assertive voice. They also need to find a logical and persuasive way of conveying information and add persuasion to their verbal messages in order to gain power in the debate. Such non-verbal features as facial expressions and head nods are important additions to further support effective debating.

2.4.2 Rhetoric and Persuasion

The topic of this research being *Influencing through language*, the Aristotelian theory of rhetoric needs a closer discussion (Aristotle 1926). The three basic elements, i.e. ethos, pathos, and logos, are the most important factors in rhetorical discourse and persuasion. By ethos, Aristotle means the personality of the speaker. This is recognizable in any spoken exchange and adds to our confidence in the person we are talking to (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005: 16). What was said to us is as important as how it was said. In all communication, this is very important and will be dealt with in more detailed manner in Study III. In rhetorical and persuasive speech in particular, multimodal or paralinguistic skills are essential for the success of the interactional exchange. Ethos also involves stance, the attitude of the persuader’s position-taking (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005: 19). The second element in Aristotle’s philosophy is pathos which refers to the emotive source of the message. For the achievement of success in persuasion, emotional appeals to both the audience and the topic are needed. Emotional engagement can be created by a variety of linguistic means, with the right choice of language, and through imagination (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005: 17). According to Aristotle, logos means persuading by reasoning. The Greek word *logos* means word, and it refers to the internal consistency of the message, the clarity of the claim, the logic of its reasons, and the effectiveness of its supporting evidence. The impact of logos on the audience is sometimes called the argument’s logical appeal (Aristotle 1997). However, in rhetorical discourse the most effective means of influencing is by appealing to emotions. The result may be manipulation, which has been used many times throughout history. Persuasive discourse strategies used in debates consist of the following ones: stating the idea and supporting it, giving evidence, logical reasoning, statistical information, facts, examples, repetition, questions, repeated questions, and appeals. Study III deals with the theme of persuasion and analyses the debates from the perspective of persuasion.

Persuasive discourse aims at influencing its audience, and two types of discourse, religious discourse, in particular sermons (Tsuda 2004), and political communication, are typical examples of its power. For centuries, by means of these two types of persuasive discourse, people have been persuaded to change their opinions and beliefs. Persuasive discourse is an interesting area for communication research. Gordon and Miller’s study (2004) of two TV debates by two U.S. presidential candidates, Vice

President Gore and Texas Governor Bush, in 2000, seen by 46.6 million TV viewers, is a case in point. According to Gordon and Miller (2004: 79), the most frequently used appeals were made to core values: democracy, equality, family, individualism, and morality. The candidates used appeals to different values: Bush appealed to individualism and Gore to equality (Gordon & Miller 2004: 84). The results indicate that those viewers who gave their votes to Gore appeared more egalitarian and those who gave their votes to Bush were undecided about their choice (Gordon & Miller 2004: 87). At the same time, the above example shows the important role of the audience in debates, which will be the topic of the following subchapter.

Aspects of the use of persuasive discourse have been studied in various fields, not only in rhetoric. Speech act theory was developed by philosophers Searle (1969) and Austin (1962). Austin (1962) described utterances as performative or constative and defined communication as “a co-operative venture between writer/speaker and one (or more) reader(s)/listener(s)” (1962: 94-101). In Austin’s view, this communication can be seen as either a locutionary (the speaker), an illocutionary (the message) or a perlocutionary act (effect of the message): while illocutionary speech acts are expressive, descriptive, and directive ways of making statements and conveying information, perlocutionary speech acts are intended to achieve certain results in a listener. The persuader will be able to draw on these speech acts to fulfil in a persuasive manner Cicero’s three ‘rhetorical duties’, to teach, to delight, and to move (Cockcroft & Cockcroft 2005: 22). Tarasti (2008) explains persuasive discourse through Searle’s speech act theory: a locutionary act corresponds to the grammatical statement proper, and the notion of illocution means the utterance in a certain situation with the aim of acting (2008: 6). One of the most accessible theories of successful speech derives from the Conversational Maxims defined by H. P. Grice (1975): these include the Maxim of Quantity ‘give exactly the amount of information which is appropriate’, the Maxim of Quality ‘be truthful’, the Maxim of Relation ‘be relevant’, and the Maxim of Manner ‘be clear’. Awareness of these principles, which have been called the cooperative principle of persuasive discourse, is important when one seeks to achieve success in conversation. It has also been a concern of Politeness Theory, a field that started to develop in 1967 when Erving Goffman noted the importance of face in conversation: positive face reflects our basic need for approval and negative face our need not to be imposed on. In successful conversation/persuasion, we need to avoid face-threatening acts by respecting social distance and status (Goffman 1981).

2.4.3 Audience/Listeners/Opponents

While the speaker/proponent plays the leading role at the beginning of the persuasive discourse interaction, the role of the listener/opponent/audience is also very important. The communicative situation may be a dialogue or a cooperative session. The forum may be a workplace or a public domain, formal or informal. The way in which the persuasive message is received depends on the characteristics of the situation and the listeners. To be successful, the evidence used in the persuasive message should be clear and organized. Whether rational messages are more effective than emotional

ones depends on both the situation and the audience. The use of evidence is dependent on the topic of the message, the speaker's age, sex, education, ethnicity, and other similar dimensions. Evidence that is persuasive to one audience, might not be persuasive to others. (Burgoon & Bettinghaus 1980) In the debates of this study, all participants were young multinational students with similar educational backgrounds. Their cultural backgrounds differed and there were marked differences in their attitudes towards the topics of the debates, i.e. restriction of alcohol and the HIV/AIDS disease.

In debating, the proponent plays the central role in supporting his/her arguments, but the focus is on the role of the opponent(s). In L2 teaching and in simulated role-plays in particular, the role division may help the participants take their stands and overcome linguistic breakdowns (Fulcher & Davidson 2007). The student can hide his/her own personality behind the role and this may give him/her more confidence for implementation of the task. In the video-recorded debates studied in this dissertation, the roles of the opponents and their counterarguments were important for the success of the debates. Persuasive discourse and argumentation carried out in a foreign language are very demanding tasks for the speakers. The difficult and unpleasant topics of the debates made argumentation even more difficult (Study III).

The effect of influencing others through vocal behaviour is noteworthy. Multimodal features, such as facial expressions, gaze, smile, gestures, and the voice, i.e. the way in which the messages are uttered, have a strong influence on the audience (Study III). Valo (1994: 114-124) has studied the beliefs and impressions created by good and poor voice quality in the listener by means of listener evaluation. According to Valo (1994), clarity was the most important characteristic in creating positive influence on the listener, and other important factors were variability, tempo, calmness, pitch, and personality, whereas high pitch, unclear and hasty voice were factors that created negative influence on the listener (1994: 117-124).

The empirical analyses of this study show many examples of the participants' efforts to appeal to the emotions of the opponents either by linguistic means or by multimodal means. One of Aristotle's rhetorical devices was the use of pathos; and although it is not an easy tool to apply in a foreign language context, the students tried to use it in their debates.

2.5 MULTIMODAL/PARALINGUISTIC FEATURES IN INTERACTION

In interaction, messages are conveyed not only through spoken language but also through gestures, facial expressions, gaze, body posture, voice, smiling, laughter, and use of space. Gestures, acts of moving one's hand(s), arms or head spontaneously, accompany speech and emphasize the meaning of the message (Sime 2006: 212). These important elements of communication are called paralinguistic and multimodal features. Multimodality and multimediality, when seen as a combination of writing, speaking, visualization, sounds, and music, are omnipresent in most of the communicative contexts in which humans engage. These modes have been ignored for a long time, as academic subjects have followed their field-specific research agendas (see Ventola et al. 2004).

The history of research on nonverbal studies dates back to the 1950s. Early studies include Kendon's edited collection *Nonverbal Communication, Interaction and Gesture* (1981), a survey of versatile issues concerning nonverbal communication, and Goffman's *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), both precursors of interaction studies that examine the relationship between sociology and linguistics. The term *nonverbal interaction* has been most frequently used to refer to all communication in which interaction is carried out by bodily movement. Poyatos (1976, 1977) has developed the idea of the triple-structure of language – paralanguage – kinesics. According to his view, the audiovisual speech stream contains the use of facial expressions, which correlate with other kinesic behaviour and the use of voice (Poyatos 2002: 170). The eyebrow raise which may often accompany the speaker's message, is an example of such emphatic paralinguistic tools (Poyatos 2002: 171). Paralanguage is part of nonverbal communication and includes the list of features mentioned at the beginning of this subchapter. Paralinguistic features may be conscious or unconscious.

The importance of both the verbal and the nonverbal is also present in Kress and van Leeuwen's multimodal theory of communication, which concentrates on two issues:

- (1) the semiotic resources of communication, the modes, and the media used, and
- (2) the communicative practices in which these resources are used. (2001: 111)

These communicative practices are multi-layered; and they contain practices of discourse, production, and distribution (Kress and van Leeuwen 2001: 111). Kress and van Leeuwen, pioneers in the field, stress that each of these layers in multimodal discourse contributes to meaning, whereas traditional linguistics claims that meaning is made once (2001: 4). Multimodal features are more and more frequently connected to communication research; and the first Finnish book on language, body, and interaction was recently published by Finnish editors Haddington and Käätä in 2011 (Haddington and Käätä 2011). This collection of articles written by Finnish linguists provides a multimodal perspective on social interaction, i.e. speech connected with gestures, eye gaze, body movement, and the use of space based on projects conducted in Finland.

Research on multimodality and language learning has produced important insight into multimodality and language learning. The role of gestures in discourse comprehension for L2 learners is vital in all speech cultures. Kida (2010), who conducted research on native/non-native interaction in France, suggests that in word-search situations, the language learner resorts to gesture. S/he makes a movement with his/her hand or arm in an attempt to illustrate the meaning of the missing word to the native speaker. Another example from his study is the use of a more assertive, "dictionary-type" voice. The learner often repeats the native's preceding utterance and does not use any gestures. The third device is the gaze that the learner directs towards the native speaker (Kida 2010). Jokinen et al. (2009) have studied eye-gazing and turn-taking in natural human-human conversation and how these observations can be extended to multimodal human-machine interaction. The study focused on eye-gaze in natural dialogues, and especially on its role as a means to coordinate and control turn-taking. The importance of eye-gaze in turn-taking has already been

established by previous research (e.g. Kendon 1967): usually the interlocutors signal their wish to give up the turn by gazing up to the interlocutor, leaning back, and dropping the pitch and loudness of his/her voice; then the partner can accordingly, start preparing to take the turn.

This study (Study II) will show that there is a strong interrelationship between oral production and multimodal/paralinguistic features in the interaction, and that it would be most important to emphasize their use in L2 university-level instruction. The most frequently used paralinguistic means in the debates of the study were gestures, among both Finnish and non-Finnish students. In addition, facial expressions, smile and laughter, and assertive voice were important markers of emotions and persuasiveness in the debates. Awareness of cross-linguistic differences in multinational interaction should be increased in language courses at all levels.

3 Method

3.1 PILOT STUDY

As mentioned above, when Finnish students enter the university, they normally have at least ten years of English studies behind them at comprehensive school and the upper level of secondary school. In addition, many of those starting their language studies at the university have spent some time abroad in an English-speaking country either working there or studying the language. When I started my work in the Language Centre at the former University of Kuopio, I already had a long experience of language teaching in various upper secondary schools and adult institutions in Finland. My first impression at the university was amazement, and I asked myself: "Why do the students not speak better English after so many years of studies at school?" The students' speaking skills were rather poor and they made a shy and reserved impression on the listener. This perception made me start to plan the pilot study in order to find an answer to the question "What kinds of communication strategies, if any, are available to the students, if the communication breaks down?" The purpose was to locate the reasons for communication breakdowns and to plan methods of teaching to help the students cope better.

For the pilot study I had the following plan: The students would play the roles of their future professions in a role-play. I investigated the most typical expert (medical doctor, nutritional therapist, social worker, nurse) cases where the client/patient comes to see the expert. I invited eight students of medicine, nursing science, nutrition, and social sciences, two from each field, to act out the roles of medical doctor, nurse, nutritional therapist, and social worker. The role of the patient or client was played by a native speaker who was not a teacher. The themes of the case studies were the most frequent situations in the students' fields. Each student had to play his/her role in two cases: an informative role and a persuasive role. The length of the role-plays was 10-15 minutes. The role-plays were audiotaped and transcribed. The analysis gave the following results, which are reported in Study II: the students of nursing science and social sciences who had some experience of practical work of their fields succeeded better than those who came directly from school. The older students knew what to say and had situational power because of their working experience. The proficiency level of English of the students of medicine and nutrition was excellent but still,

their production in the role-play situations was lower than expected. They had long pauses and hesitations in their production. In the analysis, many perspectives were taken into account. The questions asked by the students in their roles were the most important linguistic tools for carrying out the interview, and the numbers of questions varied considerably. On the whole, persuasive interviews raised more questions among the students than the informative interviews did.

Evaluations by Finnish and non-Finnish language teachers showed that there were not very great differences in interaction, fluency, grammar, pragmatics, vocabulary, communication strategies and in success/failure in the students' production.

On the basis of the questionnaires the students filled in after the role-plays, the following answers were obtained:

1. The language laboratory is not the best place to learn correct English pronunciation; a native teacher in the class every now and then would be much better.
2. Teaching of grammar at the advanced level at university is not necessary.
3. Participating in a role-play in a foreign language is an efficient way of practising the language.

Communication strategies, the main theoretical framework of the study and my main interest in the pilot study, were not familiar to the students. My own belief was that if the students had known the main principles of achievement and avoidance strategies (Tarone 1981; Faerch and Kasper 1983), they would have coped better and could have resorted to these strategies. On the whole, only a few language teachers at schools were aware of communication strategies at that time.

Later I benefited from the audiotaped recordings of the pilot study as teaching material for groups of social sciences and health sciences in the language centre and let the students evaluate the audiotaped performances in the role-plays. The evaluating students made very clever observations and commented that this kind of teaching method could be useful for language courses even in the future. I reported on the results of the pilot study at three congresses (Metsämäki 1985; 1990; 1994), but after these congresses there was a long pause in my research work.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION

In 2006, I had the opportunity to continue my unfinished research project and to collect new data for my study at the Department of Clinical Medicine and Nutrition, University of Kuopio. The results of this study are reported in Articles I, II, and III. A multinational group of MPH (Master of Public Health) students (N=33) were an appropriate group of students for my purposes. The students, both Finnish (N=21) and non-Finnish (N=12), had taken part in a two-semester course of Public Health studies with the aim of completing a Master's degree in Public Health. The non-Finnish students came from the following backgrounds: Europe (Austria, the Netherlands, and Russia), Canada, Africa (Nigeria, Ghana, Ethiopia, Somalia), and China. Their course

had consisted of a versatile array of material from the field of Public Health in the form of lectures, essay writing, individual presentations, and small group discussions. The last task for them was to participate in a debate which was video-recorded. The language of the course had been English, which was the first foreign language (EFL) or the second language (L2) for all of them. The proficiency level of the students was advanced or upper intermediate, and the language of the course was English. The course leader had chosen the following two themes for the debates:

- 1) *Restriction of alcohol at the age of eighteen encourages alcohol abuse.*
- 2) *Abstinence is the best possible way to prevent HIV/AIDS.*

The students were divided into four groups, each group being split into two sub-groups. The students were then given the topics for their debate when each group in turn entered the videoing room for the debate. Thus, the students did not know their topic in advance. The students then took their seats and had a short preparation time. During the debate, the students were placed in small groups of 4–5 students. One of the aims of the study was to investigate their interactional behaviour and use of multimodal features in the small groups. In each group there was at least one non-Finnish student, which sometimes caused the cross-cultural discussions addressed in the analysis. The students were sitting beside each other, the 'For' group in front of one microphone and the 'Against' group in front of another microphone. This was not the best possible seating arrangement, but because of the limited space in the videoing studio, the students had to be seated in a row. Sitting in a circle would have been better, because now the students did not have the best possible eye-contact. Because of this, the analysis of eye-gaze is not entirely reliable because not all group members had a good view of the other group.

3.3 ANALYSIS OF THE DEBATES

The video-recordings were transcribed according to a transcription system based on the lectures given by Sacks (1992) and edited by Tainio (1998). The tapes were transcribed in a way that allows analysis of both discursive and non-discursive (paralinguistic) features. Similarly, the research questions for each study were answered in the individual articles (I, II, III). The following general remarks and observations can be made. In the analysis, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods were used. Finnish and non-Finnish students were compared.

Debating requires a very effective and clear style of communicative speech; therefore, one of the aims was to determine how well the students could use rhetorical means for successful persuasion. In fact, persuasive strategies are based on rhetorical ways of speaking persuasively. The average length of the debates was 11 minutes.

The general atmosphere revealed joint effort and willingness of the students to create an active debate. The students aimed at logical reasoning, effective argumentation, and collaboration. In their arguments they introduced facts and figures, evidence, examples, and relevant references to statistical information. The analysis also

showed that they could use a variety of multimodal means, such as gestures, eye-gazing, facial expressions, smiling and laughter, intonational voice, affect, and emotion. The most commonly used strategies were repetition, rephrasing, reformulation, clarity, and topic negotiation.

A debate usually has a fixed structure: opening, a section of reasoning and argumentation and the final remarks or the conclusion. Each debate differed from the others, depending on the personality of the individual debaters and their interactional behaviour. Each student's participation in the groups was determined by counting all turns and comparing the average number of turns of the Finnish and non-Finnish participants. The participation framework was compiled on the basis of the lengths of the turns. In two debates, a non-Finnish student (China, Etiopia) used half of the time of the group debate and caused an uneven atmosphere in the debate. In this way, he used his interactional power to dominate the debate. In all debates, one of the students took the initial turn and at the same time he/she became the chairperson of the group. The distribution of turns uttered in the debates is shown in tables (see Study II and Study III), and the comparison showed that the difference between Finnish and non-Finnish students was quite small. The results indicate that the Finnish students were slightly more active in their turn management in 'For' groups, whereas the non-Finnish students were more active in using turns in 'Against' groups.

4 Individual Studies

The results of the study are reported in the following three published studies introduced below.

4.1 STUDY I

Metsämäki, M. (2009). Influencing through Language – University Students’ Argumentation Strategies. *AFinLA-e* 2009 (1): 61-76.

The purpose of this study was to investigate multinational university students’ argumentation skills in debating situations and, based on these results, to discover new innovative teaching methods for university-level oral skills L2 courses. The study was context-based and the method used was qualitative. Here, the students (N=33, N=12 non-Finnish, N=21 Finnish), who had been divided into groups, debated in subgroups of 4-5 students on the topics given. There were two topics chosen by the non-Finnish course-leader, one dealing with *Alcohol legislation in Finland* and the other dealing with *Prevention of HIV/AIDS*. Small groups were assigned to act out the roles of proponents or opponents.

The theoretical analysis is based on the systemic-functional framework given by Halliday (1973, 1978, 1994) and on the model created by Stillar (1998). According to Halliday (1973), language resources are organized along the lines of three general functions, viz. ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Halliday states that “sociological semantics implies not so much a general description of the semantic system of a language but rather a set of context-specific semantic descriptions, each one characterizing the meaning potential that is typically associated with a given situation type” (1978: 114). For specific analytical purposes, it is possible to focus on a particular function in a text or part of a text, but all the message-carrying units of the language exhibit the three types of functional meaning (Stillar 1998).

The research questions were:

1. How well do the students manage in the debate situation and what are the problems, if any?
2. What kind of argumentation strategies do the students use?

According to the results, one of the main concerns in the analysis was the speech functions of the utterances. In discourse, the speakers and listeners have dialogic roles assigned by the speech function of sentences. Based on the four interactive roles in the language event, Stillar (1998) divides the categories of speech functions into statements, questions, commands, and exclamations. The speech functions are influenced by contextual and situational factors (such as politeness). In this study, mainly statements and questions occurred; and the focus of the analysis was on the speech functions creating the contextual and situational messages.

The approach in this study was pragmatic. In pragmatics, the interest lies in the use of language in various situations and the functions of language. The research interest is in the language user and in the event, in what is said, how it is said, and what is the result. According to Morris, who coined the term "pragmatics" in 1938, the pragmatic perspective provides insight to the connection between language and human life in general. Hence, pragmatics is also the link between linguistics and the rest of the humanities and social sciences. Verschueren (1999) wanted to emphasize the meaningful functioning of language in general, the meaning in relation to context, claiming that principles of coherence and relevance in building arguments have a close affinity with rhetorics and pragmatics.

The study was conducted with qualitative research methods. The aim was to ascertain what kinds of argumentation strategies the students used in debating and how well they coped if they had problems. According to the results, the students used repetition, restructuring, rephrasing, questions, repeated questions, and collaborative strategy, and they coped fairly well in their roles as proponents and opponents. There was, however, hesitation due to lack of linguistic resources. In the answers given in the questionnaires, the students expressed their willingness to participate in debate and argumentation courses if these were offered by the university.

4.2 STUDY II

Metsämäki, M. (2011). Paralinguistic Means and Their Role in University Students' L2 Debate. *Lingua Americana* 29 (December 2011): 39-61.

The aim of this study was to investigate multimodal communication behaviour with a particular reference to its role in creating turns of argumentative sequences in university students' L2 debates. In addition, the interrelationship between language and affect in the interactional process was studied. This research was carried out at the former University of Kuopio with a group of multinational students as subjects. The students had been studying Public Health for two semesters, and their final task was to participate in a debate session by acting out the role of either proponent or opponent. The group of subjects consisted of 33 (N=33) multinational students, of whom 21 (N=21) were Finnish and 12 (N=12) were non-Finnish. The topics of the debates had been chosen by their non-Finnish course leader and they dealt with Finnish alcohol legislation and prevention of HIV/AIDS. The students had been divided into subgroups of 4-5 students and two groups, proponents and opponents, entered the

videoing room and received the topic of their debate. There was at least one non-Finnish student in each subgroup. The length of each debate was about 10 minutes.

The main interest in this study was in the use of nonverbal communication, a form that has most frequently been used to refer to all communication in which interaction is carried out by bodily movement, gesture, facial expression, posture and spacing, touch, and smell. The study is inspired by Poyatos's (1976, 1977) idea of the triple-structure of *language – paralanguage – kinesics*. According to Poyatos (2002: 170), speech is linked with the use of facial gestures, which further correlate with paralinguistic features and kinesics. The research is also based on Kress and van Leeuwen's (2001) understanding of multimodality, which describes communicative practices as multi-layered: the verbal and the non-verbal are both important to the meaning.

The research questions of the study were:

1. What kinds of paralinguistic means are available to the university students in L2 debates?
2. What kinds of differences in the use of paralinguistic means, if any, are there between Finnish and non-Finnish debate participants and between Groups For and Against?

The methods of analysis were both qualitative and quantitative. The debates were transcribed in such a way that various features of paralinguistic behaviour could be analyzed and intercultural differences in their use could be studied.

The results revealed that the students could use a variety of paralinguistic features, such as gestures, eye-gazing, facial expressions, smiling and laughter, intonational voice, affect and emotions. Cultural differences could be found and the inter-relationship between paralinguistic features and turntaking was investigated. The most frequently used paralinguistic feature was gesture, which was used 89 times by the Finnish students (N=21) and 162 times by the non-Finnish students (N=12). Turn management in relation to paralinguistic features showed that the Finnish students used 10.7 turns per person during the debates, whereas the non-Finnish students had 26.8 turns per person during the debate. According to these results, the non-Finnish students are more active in using paralinguistic features in their speech and more passive to use turns in debating than the non-Finnish participants are. The results of the study indicate that language alone is not enough in interaction and that new patterns for future curricula in university-level L2 language instruction are needed. The results suggest that the foreign students had more paralinguistic tools available to them than the Finnish students did. The Finnish students were more active in their opponent roles and used more paralinguistic features when acting out the opponent roles than the foreign students did.

4.3 STUDY III

Metsämäki, M. (2012). Persuasive Discourse in EFL Debate. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2 (February 2012): 205-213.

This study concentrated on the use of persuasive strategies in multinational university students' EFL debate. The students, the same group of multinational MPH students as in the other studies of the project (N=33, N=21 Finnish, N=12 non-Finnish), had to act out the roles of proponents and opponents in debates on given themes in institutional settings. Their use of strategies was analyzed by using principles based on Aristotelian rhetoric. The method of analysis was both quantitative and qualitative. According to the results, the students were able to use rhetorical devices, i.e. to express ethos, pathos, and logos, in their argumentation. They were able to use logical reasoning, give examples, provide statistical information, and support their arguments with evidence. Their persuasive strategies consisted of restructuring, repetition, questioning, appeals, and intonational assertive use of voice. A comparison of cross-cultural differences showed that the non-Finnish students used logical reasoning, restructuring, and appeals in their L2 debating more frequently than the Finnish students did.

The genre of persuasive discourse, which belongs to the oldest styles of discourse, was studied and practised already in antiquity. In my study, I first made a historical survey of Roman times where the sons of patriotic families had to study rhetoric to become good orators. The main principles of rhetorical speech, launched by Aristotle, have remained as the principal guidelines of the discipline, and classical rhetoric is now studied in many universities throughout the world. The study of argumentation has gradually developed from a marginal part of logic and rhetoric into a genuine and interdisciplinary academic discipline. The notion of discursive power is frequently related to persuasion. While power is always part of language use, its role is emphasized more in persuasive discourse that intentionally emphasizes the influence of language. In fact, persuasion and power appear to go hand in hand (Fairclough 2001).

The research questions in this study were:

1. What kinds of persuasive devices are available to students in a demanding debating situation in English?
2. What kinds of cross-cultural differences are there in Finnish and non-Finnish students' use of persuasive discourse?

In persuasive communication, the speakers try to influence the behaviour of others with the aim of trying to make them alter their opinions, beliefs, attitudes, and values. The role of the speaker in persuasion is the most important part of the process; in addition, the nature and structure of the message and the role of the audience are significant. Persuasion is successful if it leads to a change in attitude (Simons et al. 2001).

In the analysis, the most typical features of persuasive discourse and appeals were listed, and the results for the Finnish and non-Finnish students were compared. The rhetorical devices, the appearance of ethos, pathos, and logos, were analyzed. The features of persuasive discourse consisted of the following: logical reasoning, repetition, questions, repeated questions, restructuring, and appeals to emotion.

The results also show that there were distinct differences in the use of persuasive features in Finnish and non-Finnish students. The most frequently used features of persuasive speech were repetitions, questions, and repeated questions. Non-Finnish participants more often used logical reasoning, restructuring, appeals and repetition than the Finnish participants did, whereas the use of questions and repeated questions was more frequent among the Finnish participants.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

This thesis has discussed the theme of *Influencing through Language* with special focus on L2 teaching to university-level students at a university language centre in a research project carried out at the former University of Kuopio in spring 2006. The initial phases of the project date back to my first years as lecturer of English at the Kuopio University Language Centre in the late 1980s. Already then, I was planning to discover the reasons for students' poor production skills in English. I wanted to determine the reasons for breakdowns, with the aim of finding ways to promote L2 oral skills teaching. The studies included in this thesis deal with argumentation and debating, rhetorical devices and persuasive discourse, and paralinguistic/multimodal features of discourse, which are all essential elements of influencing.

In response to the first research question formulated in Chapter 1.1, the results suggest that the students had a variety of argumentation strategies at their disposal: straightforward statements, evidence, facts, statistical information, examples, logical reasoning, repetition, restructuring, questions, repeated questions, and assertive and emphatic words. Appeals to experts, information resources, and emotions were also used. To answer the second research question, it can be stated that the students used many paralinguistic/nonverbal features during their argumentation. The most frequently used tools were gestures, head nods, body movement, eye-gaze, facial expressions, smiling, laughter, and intonational tone of voice. The third research question addressed the cross-cultural differences in a debate situation. According to the results, the non-Finnish participants more frequently used several argumentation strategies. Only questions and repeated questions were used more frequently by the Finnish participants. Similarly, the Finnish students were more active in the opponents' roles and used more turns than the non-Finnish students did, whereas the non-Finnish students were more active in the proponents' roles. Use of gestures was the most frequently used paralinguistic means, and the non-Finnish participants used gestures twice as often as the Finns did. Gestures were always connected to speech, and they were effected by movement of both hands and arms. Gestures may have many functions, but in these debates the function of the gestures was to emphasize the influence of the message. African male students used longer turns in their arguments than the Finnish students did and thus applied their discursive power. With regard to the small number of subjects in this study, it is impossible to generalize the

results obtained, which are based on the comparisons between the Finnish and non-Finnish debate groups.

The results of the study indicate that debating and argumentation are useful ways of practising oral skills in L2 courses at university level. Instruction of paralinguistic/multimodal features can well be included in the same courses. Brown (2009) suggested content-based courses in argumentation and debate with the dual goals of teaching logic and reasoning and of improving students' command of their first foreign language skills. Swain (1993) referred to collaborative learning in the form of oral debates as the output hypothesis, meaning that according to it the students "push their linguistic competence to its limit as they attempt to express their ideas" (1993: 162). The results of my study support this hypothesis. Goodwin (2003) gained positive experiences from teaching debating across the curriculum in order to promote small group communication. The students' feedback was very positive, and they wanted to have more of such courses, because the debates had provided them with critical thinking skills (Goodwin 2003). Benefits of debating have been reported in other studies. Colbert (1995) reveals that critical thinking develops students' way of thinking and is very challenging for them. A cross-cultural perspective is provided in Durkin's (2008) study of East Asian Master's students' perceptions of critical argumentation as taught at British universities. It is evident that students coming from East Asia are aware of the cultural differences and resist adopting Western norms, which easily leads to misunderstandings (Durkin 2008).

As stated in Chapter 2.2, there is no compulsory oral test in the Finnish Matriculation Examination for English. Few students take part in the voluntary oral test and what is worst: L2 oral skills are not adequately practised at school, because these skills are not tested in the final test. The first thing that should be done to enhance the willingness to practise oral exercises is to try and make the oral test in the school-leaving test compulsory. This has been emphasized by many researchers and language teachers (cf. Pietilä 2003; Takala 2004).

When planning L2 teaching for advanced university level learners in Finland, planners have to keep in mind that globalization, which means that English is becoming a more and more widely used 'global language', English as a *Lingua Franca*, means that in addition to the growing need for better oral skills of English, also awareness of cross-cultural differences and communicative conventions in other cultures needs to be studied; and oral presentation and debating courses should be included in the university curricula. To help the students to manage at the university and in international seminars and congresses abroad, all students should be provided with oral presentation courses (cf. Pietilä 2001).

English has become the key international language in academia, as is also seen in Mauranen's (2010) research on English as a *Lingua Franca* in the academic context. The proficiency level of the students is rather high, but the research data reveal many moments when the language used does not sound natural. The problem with the exchange students is that few of them speak English as their mother tongue. Accordingly, the language that they speak is not always very good. Universities should offer English courses to these students in order to improve their skills improve during their stay in Finland.

As a general assessment of the research project, it can be stated that in spite of the limited debating time and no preparation, the students managed fairly well and did their best to achieve satisfying results in their debates. Role-plays proved to be a successful research method for debating, even though the themes were not motivating. In all debates, acting out of the roles was strengthened by the collaborative strategy in all debates. With more inspiring topics debating would have been more interesting. The participation framework shows the individual lengths of the turns of the debaters. The two non-Finnish male students who used most of their groups' debating time certainly used considerable discursive power by taking time from the other participants.

The feedback given by students in their questionnaires after the debates showed that the atmosphere was positive, which may encourage planners and curriculum designers to make further efforts towards developing innovative, modern, and motivating courses. However, the Finnish students were not willing to take part in another debating session with new, more inspiring themes, because this was not part of the compulsory course. Three foreign students came to a new session with many interesting themes.

When the project and its success are evaluated, it can be stated that with more subject groups the results would have given more complete and reliable results. In future research, several issues should be considered: considering the number of participants and groups and preparing lists of interesting topics for debates would give better results and provide more reliable advice for the future curricula designers of oral skills courses at university language centres.

The international research literature (Ardila 2001; Serrano et al. 2011; Pan 2010; Richards 2006; Brown 2009) provides a variety of interesting suggestions for new course themes: scientific mini-debates, learning with native speakers either in the domestic environment or abroad, intensive or semi-intensive courses where another subject, e.g. history is combined with practising L2, integration of oral and written skills in teaching and learning a foreign language, and electronic conferencing. New technology should be exploited more effectively in language instruction. Well-organized debating courses with modern, interesting tasks for the students would be challenging and useful. Content-based learning (CBL) combined with multimodal exercises could well be included in these activities. In this way awareness of many cross-cultural and paralinguistic/multimodal features could be raised and disseminated in this way to the environment outside the university. The results give impetus for further research projects on debating with new interesting themes.

This study has been an attempt to investigate university students' verbal and nonverbal debating and argumentation skills with special focus on cross-cultural differences in students' L2 interactions. Considering the small number of subjects in this study, the results cannot be generalized. At any rate, the results show that role-play practices may be a useful and motivating method of practising English by using modern technology and letting the students participate in course planning.

Bibliography

PRINTED MATERIALS

- Alanen, R. (2011). Kysely tutkijan työkaluna. In *Kieltä tutkimassa – tutkielman laatijan opas*. Eds. P. Kalaja, R. Alanen & H. Dufva. Helsinki: Finnlectura. 146-161.
- Ardila, J. A. G. (2001). An assessment of paralinguistic demands within present-day cross-cultural foreign language teaching. *IRAL* 39 (4): 333-339.
- Aristotle. (1926). *The Art of Rhetoric*. Trans. J. H. Freese. London: Heinemann.
- Aristotle. (1997). *Retoriikka. Runousoppi*. Trans. P. Hohti. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bartanen, K. (1995). Developing student voices in academic debate through a feminist perspective of learning, knowing, and arguing. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 16: 1-13.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. J. B. Thompson. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brown, N.A. (2009). Argumentation and debate in foreign language instruction: A case for the traditional classroom facilitating advanced-level language uptake. *Modern Language Journal* 93: 534-549.
- Burgoon, M. & E. P. Bettinghaus. (1980). Persuasive message strategies. In *Persuasion: New Directions in Theory and Research*. Eds. M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller. London: Sage. 141-169.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In *Language and Communication*. Eds. J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt. New York: Longman. 2-26.
- Canale, M. & M. Swain. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1 (1): 1-47.
- Carbaugh, D. (1995). Are Americans really superficial? Notes on Finnish and American cultures in linguistic action. In *Kieli & kulttuuri oppimisessa ja opettamisessa*. Ed. L. Salo-Lee. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Department of Communication. 53-60.
- Celce-Murcia, M. et al. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 6 (2): 5-35.
- Cockcroft, R. & S. Cockcroft. (2005). *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Colbert, K. R. (1995). Enhancing critical thinking ability through academic debate. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 16: 52-72.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *IRAL* 5: 161-170.

- Corder, S. P. (1982). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P. & J. Heritage. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Eds. P. Drew & J. Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-64.
- Durkin, K. (2008). The middle way: East Asian master's students' perceptions of critical argumentation in U.K. universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 12 (1): 38-55.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Faerch, C. & G. Kasper. (1983). On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage communication. In *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. Eds. C. Faerch & G. Kasper. London: Longman. 210-238.
- Fulcher, G. & F. Davidson. (2007). *Language Testing and Assessment*. London: Routledge.
- Gass, S. & L. Selinker. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gordon, A. & J. L. Miller. (2004). Values and persuasion during the first Bush-Gore presidential debate. *Political Communication* 21: 171-192.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodwin, J. (2003). Students' perspectives on debate exercises in content area classes. In *Communication Education* 52 (2): 157-163.
- Gregory, M. & M. Holloway. (2005). The debate as a pedagogic tool in social policy for social work students. *Social Work Education* 24: 617-637.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts*. Eds. P. Cole & J. L. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 1. Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Haddington, P. & L. Kääntä (eds). (2011). *Kieli, keho ja vuorovaikutus: Multimodaalinen näkökulma sosiaaliseen toimintaan*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Arnold.
- Hutchby, I. (1996). *Confrontation Talk: Arguments, Asymmetries and Power on Talk Radio*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association Inc.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In *Sociolinguistics*. Eds. J. B. Pride & J. Holmes. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 269-293.
- Jarvis, S. & A. Pavlenko. (2008). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitudes and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jokinen, K., M. Nishida, & S. Yamamoto. (2009). Eye-gaze experiments for conversation monitoring. In *Procs. of IUCS '09*. New York, NY: IUCS. 303-308.

- Kakkuri-Knuuttila, M-L. & I. Halonen. (2007). *Argumentti ja kritiikki: Lukemisen, keskustelun ja vakuuttamisen taidot*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Kasper, G. (1982). Teaching-induced aspects of interlanguage discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 4 (2): 99-113.
- Kendon, A. (1967). Some functions of gaze direction in social interaction. *Acta Psychologica* 26: 22-63.
- Kendon, A. (ed). (1981). *Nonverbal Communication, Interaction and Gesture*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Kida, T. (2010). Multimodality in native/nonnative interaction: A case of negotiation of/for meaning. http://www.semioticon.com/virtuals/talks/kida_eng.pdf
- Krashen, S. (2009 [1982]). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Internet ed. http://www.sdkrashen.com/Principles_and.../Principles_and_Practice.pdf
- Krashen, S. (1987). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman.
- Kress, G. & T. van Leeuwen. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold.
- Lado, R. (1957). Excerpts from linguistics across cultures. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.) (1983). 21-31.
- Laki ylioppilastutkinnon järjestämisestä/Act on the Organization of the Matriculation Examination 672/2005.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lantolf, J. P. & S. L. Thorne. (2006). *Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G. N. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longmans Group Limited.
- Lehtonen, J., K. Sajavaara & A. May. (1977). *Spoken English: The Perceptions and Production of English on a Finnish-English Contrastive Basis*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.
- Lehtonen, J. & K. Sajavaara. (1983). From traditional contrastive linguistics towards a communicative approach: Theory and applications within the Finnish-English cross-language project. In *Cross-Language Analysis and Second Language Acquisition I*. Ed. Kari Sajavaara. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Department of English. 81-94.
- Lukiolaki/Upper Secondary School Act 629/1998.
- Mauranen, A. (2010). Features of English as a lingua franca in academia. *Helsinki English Studies* 6: 6-28.
- Meriläinen, L. (2010). *Language Transfer in the Written English of Finnish Students*. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.
- Metsämäki, M. (1985). University students' spoken interaction. FIPLV (Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes) Congress. University of Helsinki. Unpublished Congress Paper.
- Metsämäki, M. (1990). A message-centered approach to informative and persuasive speech. AILA 9th World Congress of Applied Linguistics. Thessaloniki. Unpublished Congress Paper.
- Metsämäki, M. (1994). The use of power in speech situations. FIPLV Congress. Hamburg. Unpublished Congress Paper.
- Metsämäki, M. (2007). Discursive power in interaction in institutional discourse. 9th World Congress of IASS-AIS. University of Helsinki. Unpublished Congress Paper.

- Metsämäki, M. (2008). Discursive power in interaction in institutional discourse. In *Gemeinschaft, Umgebung und Sicherheit: Karl Kruzs 75 Jahre am 15.2.2008*. Herausgegeben von J. Laurinkari. Kuopio: Suomen Graafiset Palvelut Oy. 117-124.
- Metsämäki, M. (2009). Small-group interaction and ways of persuading in multinational groups of students. 10th World Congress of IASS-AIS. La Coruna. Unpublished Congress Paper.
- Metsämäki, M. (2010). Towards effective communication in social and health sector. In *Health, Wellness and Social Policy: Essays in Honour of Guy Bäckman*. Ed. J. Laurinkari. Bremen: Europäischer Bochsulverlag GmbH & Co. KG. 159-179.
- Nikula, T. (2000). Pragmaattinen näkökulma kieleen. *Kieli, diskurssi ja yhteisö*. Eds. K. Sajavaara & A. Piirainen-Marsh. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto. 331-358.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language Transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Odlin, T. (2005). Crosslinguistic influence and conceptual transfer: What are the concepts? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 25: 3-25.
- Pan, L. (2010). A study on public speaking in Korean education for Chinese students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1 (6): 922-925.
- Pietilä, P. (1999). *L2 SPEECH: Oral Proficiency of Students of English at University Level*. *Anglicana Turkuensia* 19. Turku: University of Turku.
- Pietilä, P. (2001). Speaking skills in a foreign language: Reflections on the teaching of conversational skills. In *Language, Learning, Literature: Studies Presented to Håkan Ringbom*. Eds. M. Gill, A. Johnson, L. Koski, L., R. Sell, & B. Wårvik. English Department Publications 4. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University. 101-110.
- Pietilä, P. (2003). Speaking skills of advanced learners: The Finnish perspective. *Journal of Humanities* (Jinbun Kenkyu) 30: 450-461.
- Pietilä, P. (2004). Conversational skills and discourse strategies in a foreign language. In *Approaches to Style and Discourse in English*. Eds. R. Hiltunen & S. Watanabe. Osaka: Osaka University Press. 209-224.
- Piirainen-Marsh, A. (1995). *Face in Second-Language Conversation*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä Press.
- Pohl, G. (2004). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure and implications for language teaching. *SLLT* 4: 1-10. <http://www.usq.edu.au/users/sonjb/sllt/4/Pohl04>.
- Poyatos, F. (1976). *Man beyond Words: Theory and Methodology of Nonverbal Communication*. Oswego, New York: New York State English Council.
- Poyatos, F. (1977). The morphological and functional approach to kinesics in the context of interaction and culture. *Semiotica* 21 (3/4): 295-337.
- Poyatos, F. (2002). *Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines. Vol. II. Paralanguage, Kinesics, Silence, Personal and Environmental Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). Developing classroom speaking activities: From theory to practice. *Guidelines* (RELC, Singapore) 28 (2): 3-9.
- Riley, P. (1980). When communication breaks down: Levels of coherence in discourse. *Applied Linguistics* 1 (3): 201-216.
- Riley, P. (1989). Well, don't blame me! On the interpretation of pragmatic errors. In *Contrastive Pragmatics*. Ed W. Oleksy. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 231-249.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation. Volumes I and II*. Ed. G. Jefferson with Introduction by E. A. Schegloff. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Sallinen, A. (2000). Suomalainen viestintäkulttuuri eurooppalaisessa kontekstissa. In *Nykytietoa puheviestinnän opetuksesta*. Ed. Maarit Valo. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Department of Communication. 6-14.
- Sallinen-Kuparinen, A. (1986). *Finnish Communication Reticence: Perceptions and Self-Reported Speech*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Schiffrin, D. (1985). Everyday argument: The organization of diversity in talk. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Ed. T. A. Van Dijk. Vol. 3. London: Academic Press. 35-46.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10: 219-31.
- Serrano, R., A. Llanes & E. Tragant. (2011). Analyzing the effect of context of second language learning: Domestic intensive and semi-intensive courses vs. study abroad in Europe. *System* 39: 133-143.
- Sime, D. (2006). What do learners make of teachers' gestures in the classroom? *IRAL* 44: 211-230.
- Simon, S., S. Erduran & J. Osborne. (2006). Learning to teach argumentation: Research and development in the science classroom. *International Journal of Science Education* 28 (2-3): 235-260.
- Simonneaux, L. (2001). Role-play or debate to promote students' argumentation and justification on an issue in animal transgenesis. *International Journal of Science Education* 23 (9): 903-927.
- Simons, H. W., J. Morreale & B. Gronbeck. (2001). *Persuasion in Society*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 25-39.
- Slater, T. F. (2010). Enhancing learning through scientific mini-debates. *The Physics Teacher* 48 (Sept): 425-426.
- Stillar, G. F. (1998). *Analyzing Everyday Texts: Discourse, Rhetoric, and Social Perspective*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stotesbury, H. (2007). Englannin opetuksen uusjako – mitä tutkinnonuudistus sai aikaan kielikeskuksessa? In *Kieli oppimisessa – Language in Learning: AFinLA Yearbook 2007*. Eds. O-P. Salo, T. Nikula & P. Kalaja. Jyväskylä: AFinLA. 33-71.
- Swain, M. (1993). *Theory and Research: The Output Hypothesis*. London: Routledge.
- Tainio, L. (1998). *Keskustelunanalyysin perusteet*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Takala, S. (2004). Englannin kielitaidon tasosta Suomessa. In *Kansainväliset IEA-tutkimukset Suomi-kuvaa luomassa*. Ed. K. Leimu. Jyväskylä: Institute of Educational Research. University of Jyväskylä. 255-275.
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarasti, E. (2008). Retoriikka ja musiikin diskurssi. *Synteesi: Taiteiden välisen tutkimuksen aikakauslehti* 27 (1): 2-26.
- Tarone, E. (1988). *Variation in Interlanguage*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning* 30 (2): 427-431.
- Thomas, L, S. Wareing, I. Singh, J. S.Peccei, J. Thornborrow & J. Jones (eds.) (2004). *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Thornborrow, J. (2002). *Power Talk: Language and Interaction in Institutional Discourse*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education.

- Tsuda, A. (2004). Persuasive discourse: Homilectics on Easter in Japanese and American speech communities. In *Approaches to Style and Discourse in English*. Eds. R. Hiltunen & S. Watanabe. Osaka: Osaka University Press. 225-236.
- Valo, M. (1994). *Käsitykset ja vaikutelmat äänestä: Kuuntelijoiden arviointia radiopuheen äänellisistä ominaisuuksista*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Valtioneuvoston asetus ylioppilastutkinnosta/Government Decree on the Matriculation Examination 915/2005.
- Valtioneuvoston asetus lukiokoulutuksen yleisistä valtakunnallisista tavoitteista ja tuntijaosta/Government Decree on the General National Aims and Division of Teaching Hours at the Upper Secondary School 955/2002.
- Ventola, E., C. Charles, M. Kaltenbacher & A. Hofinger (eds). (2004). *Perspectives on Multimodality*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Wareing, S. (2004). What is language and what does it do? In Thomas et al. (eds.) 1-16.
- Wilkins, R. J. (2009). The *asiasta puhuminen* event. In Wilkins & Isotalus (eds.) 63-84.
- Wilkins, R. J. & P. Isotalus. (2009). Finnish speech culture. In Wilkins & Isotalus (eds) 1-16.
- Wilkins, R. J. & P. Isotalus (eds.) (2009). *Speech Culture in Finland*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Ylikoski, M. (1987). *Väittele viisaasti*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta. (2006). Ylioppilastutkintolautakunnan yleiset määräykset ja ohjeet 2006: 1-2. <http://www.ylioppilastutkinto.fi/fi/maaraykset/ohjeet/>
- Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, R. F. (2009). *Discursive Practice in Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Wiley.

INTERNET SITES

<http://www.ylioppilastutkinnot.fi>

http://www.enqa.eu/bologna_overview

**PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND
DISSERTATIONS IN EDUCATION, HUMANITIES, AND THEOLOGY**

1. Taru Viinikainen. *Taipuuko "akrobaatti Aleksandra"? Nimikekonstruktio ja nimikkeen taipuminen lehtikielessä 1900-luvulta 2000-luvulle*. 2010.
2. Pekka Metso. *Divine Presence in the Eucharistic Theology of Nicholas Cabasilas*. 2010.
3. Pekka Kilpeläinen. *In Search of a Postcategorical Utopia. James Baldwin and the Politics of 'Race' and Sexuality*. 2010.
4. Leena Vartiainen. *Yhteisöllinen käsityö. Verkostoja, taitoja ja yhteisiä elämyksiä*. 2010.
5. Alexandra Simon-López. *Hypersurrealism. Surrealist Literary Hypertexts*. 2010.
6. Merja Sagulin. *Jälkiä ajan hiekassa. Kontekstuaalinen tutkimus Daniel Defoen Robinson Crusoen suomenkielisten adaptaatioiden aatteellisista ja kirjallisista traditioista sekä subjektikäsitteistä*. 2010.
7. Pirkko Pollari. *Vapaan sivistystyön kieltenopettajien pedagogiset ratkaisut ja käytännöt teknologiaa hyödyntävässä vieraiden kielten opetuksessa*. 2010.
8. Ulla Piela. *Kansanparannuksen kerrotut merkitykset Pohjois-Karjalassa 1800- ja 1900-luvuilla*. 2010.
9. Lea Meriläinen. *Language Transfer in the Written English of Finnish Students*. 2010.
10. Kati Aho-Mustonen. *Group Psychoeducation for Forensic Long-term Patients with Schizophrenia*. 2011.
11. Anne-Maria Nupponen. *»Savon murre» savolaiskorvin. Kansa murteen havainnointi*. 2011.
12. Teemu Valtonen. *An Insight into Collaborative Learning with ICT: Teachers' and Students' Perspectives*. 2011.
13. Teemu Kakkuri. *Evankelinen liike kirkossa ja yhteiskunnassa 1944-1963. Aktiivinen uudistusliike ja konservatiivinen sopeutuja*. 2011.
14. Riitta Kärkkäinen. *Doing Better? Children's and Their Parents' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Malleability of the Child's Academic Competences*. 2011.
15. Jouko Kiiski. *Suomalainen avioero 2000-luvun alussa. Miksi avioliitto puretaan, miten ero koetaan ja miten siitä selviydytään*. 2011.
16. Liisa Timonen. *Kansainvälisty tai väisty? Tapaustutkimus kansainvälisyysosaamisen ja kulttuurienvälisen oppimisen merkityksenannoista oppijan, opettajan ja korkeakoulutoimijan pedagogisen suhteen rajaamissa kohtaamisen tiloissa*. 2011.
17. Matti Vänttinen. *Oikeasti hyvä numero. Oppilaiden arvioinnin totuudet ja totuustuotanto rinnakkaiskoulusta yhtenäiskouluun*. 2011.
18. Merja Ylönen. *Aikuiset opin poluilla. Oppimistukikeskuksen asiakkaiden opiskelukokemuksista ja koulutautumishalukkuudelle merkityksellisistä tekijöistä*. 2011.
19. Kirsi Pankarinkangas. *Leskien keski-ikässä tai myöhemmällä iällä solmimat uudet avioliitot. Seurantatutkimus*. 2011.
20. Olavi Leino. *Oppisopimusopiskelijan oppimisen henkilökohtaistaminen ja oppimismahdollisuudet työpaikalla*. 2011.

MAIJA METSÄMÄKI
*Influencing
through Language:
Studies in L2 Debate*

This study examines multinational university students' L2 debating skills with special focus on argumentation strategies and paralinguistic/multimodal features. It also addresses their use of rhetorical means and persuasion. The study seeks to discover new innovative methods for advanced oral skills teaching and raise awareness of cross-cultural differences in discourse.



UNIVERSITY OF
EASTERN FINLAND

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND
Dissertations in Education, Humanities, and Theology

ISBN: 978-952-61-0878-0 (print)

ISSNL: 1798-5625

ISSN: 1798-5625

ISBN: 978-952-61-0879-7 (pdf)

ISSN: 1798-5633 (pdf)

21. Kristiina Abdallah. *Translators in Production Networks. Reflections on Agency, Quality and Ethics*. 2012.
22. Riina Kokkonen. *Mittarissa lapsen keho ja vanhemmuus – tervettä lasta sekä ”hyvää” ja ”huonoa” vanhemmuutta koskevia tulkintoja nyky-Suomessa*. 2012.
23. Ari Sivenius. *Aikuislukion eetos opettajien merkityksenantojen valossa*. 2012.
24. Kamal Sbiri. *Voices from the Margin. Rethinking History, Identity, and Belonging in the Contemporary North African Anglophone Novel*. 2012.
25. Ville Sassi. *Uudenlaisen pahan unohdettu historia. Arvohistoriallinen tutkimus 1980-luvun suomalaisen romaanin pahan tematiikasta ja ”pahan koulukunta” –vuosikymmenmääritteen muodostumisesta kirjallisuusjärjestelmässä*. 2012.
26. Merja Hyytiäinen. *Integroiden, segregoiden ja osallistaen. Kolmen vaikeasti kehitysvammaisen oppilaan opiskelu yleisopetuksessa ja koulupolku esiopetuksesta toiselle asteelle*. 2012.
27. Hanna Mikkola. *”Tänään työ on kauneus on ruumis on laihuus.” Feministinen luenta syömishäiriöiden ja naissukupuolen kytköksistä suomalaisissa syömishäiriöromaanissa*. 2012.
28. Aino Äikäs. *Toiselta asteelta eteenpäin. Narratiivinen tutkimus vaikeavammaisen nuoren aikuisen koulutuksesta ja työllistymisestä*. 2012.
29. Maija Korhonen. *Yrittäjyyttä ja yrittäjämäisyyttä kaikille? Uusliberalistinen hallinta, koulutettavuus ja sosiaaliset erot peruskoulun yrittäjyyskasvatuksessa*. 2012.
30. Päivikki Ronkainen. *Yhteinen tehtävä. Muutoksen avaama kehittämissyrkimys opettajayhteisössä*. 2012.
31. Kalevi Paldanius. *Eläinlääkärin ammatti-identiteetti, asiakasvuorovaikutuksen jännitteiden hallinta ja kliinisen päättelyn yhteenkietoutuminen sekapraktiikassa*. 2012.
32. Kari Korolainen. *Koristelun kuvailu. Kategorisoinnin analyysi*. 2012.
33. Maija Metsämäki. *Influencing through Language. Studies in L2 Debate*. 2012.