

Fifth WU Symposium on International Business Communication

**What is specific about teaching
languages for specific purposes?
Learning from and across individual
disciplines**

Vienna, 28 – 30 November 2012

ABSTRACTS

Gerd ANTOS (Marthin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg)

LSP mediated knowledge between autarkic and public communication

gerd.antos@germanistik.uni-halle.de

LSP mediated knowledge is mostly inside knowledge. When specialists communicate among themselves, they cut off the public sphere. In the first part of the talk I will argue - somewhat provocatively - that LSP are embedded in a culture of "autarkic communication". In the context of today's communication in biology, computer science, ecology, politics and economics, "autarkic" means "independent from its surroundings, self-sufficient". As I will argue, LSP are therefore forms of self-sufficient communication - with many advantages, but also with the many problems autarkic communication brings along, partitioning and social exclusion. The second part of the talk focuses on the global problem of autarkic communication. More and more people in different cultures have to have (subject-) specific knowledge. Communication in the law is a case in point. Also, the example of *Public Understanding of Science and Humanities* (PUSH) shows how strong the demand for knowledge for everyday use really is. Finally, I shall discuss the question of how can scientists, particularly linguists, be enabled to "translate" knowledge into the public sphere?

Gerd Antos is Professor in German Linguistics at the Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg and at the Pannonian University of Veszprém (Hungary). He is a former chairman of the German Society of Applied Linguistics (GAL). His research interests include applied linguistics, communication in the knowledge society, as well as text- and discourse-linguistics. Karlfried Knapp/ Gerd Antos (eds.): Handbooks of Applied Linguistics. Communication Competence. Language and Communication Problems. Practical Solutions. Mouton de Gruyter (10 Vol. 2008-2013). Sigurd Wichter/Gerd Antos (eds.) (2001-): Transferwissenschaft (8 Vol.). Peter Lang Verlag Frankfurt.

G. GARZONE (University of Milan)

Genres and text types in the teaching of business communication

giuliana.garzone@unimi.it

Genre-based pedagogy is quite commonly used in the teaching of business English communication at university level, as not only does recourse to the genre notion provide a useful tool for categorization with a view to curriculum / syllabus compilation, but it also qualifies as an instrument to favour the student's acquisition of the ability to correlate various aspects of language use to content and purpose, and to a whole range of sociocultural variables inherent in contexts, situations and events, as well as in participants' relations and in social practices. Within this framework, an especially problematic issue that emerges when the students involved are non-native (NN) speakers of English is how to reconcile the modern view of genre as a form of social action with the need to train learners not only in the correct use of genres as a function of

situation, context and rhetorical purposes, but also in the appropriate use of lexico-grammatical features to achieve such purposes.

In this respect the rhetorical, cognitive-based analysis of texts into moves and steps, albeit effective in terms of awareness of text construction requisites and situational/social implications, can be problematic with a view to the creation of an inventory of the linguistic exponents used to realize them, especially on account of the very high number of possible moves/steps for certain genres (e.g. annual company reports and other types of reports: cf. among others de Groot 2010) and the high degree of variability in their linguistic encoding. More specifically, it is often found that while students may achieve a reasonable understanding of the overall rhetorical organization of a given genre, they may still find it difficult to operationalize it, genre knowledge not being easily transferable to the micro-level of finer linguistic structuring.

In this presentation I am going to suggest that in ESP teaching to NN students, it may be useful to integrate the notion of genre with that of text type, so that the rhetorical actions that are central to genre description and categorization can be correlated with the lower levels of communication and linguistic encoding to which the notion of text type refers. A further advantage is that in this way work on microstructures – necessary as it is with most groups of second- or foreign language learners (except the most advanced ones) – can be made meaningful by highlighting the discursive relevance of linguistic choices, even the most basic ones (i.e. transitivity structure, choice of active, passive or ergative, etc.).

The model proposed is illustrated with reference to the results of its application in two Master's Programmes (in Languages and Cultures for International Communication and in International Relations) at Milan University.

*Giuliana Garzone is Full Professor of English Linguistics and Translation at Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy. Her main field of investigation is specialized discourse in its different domains, which she has explored in a discourse analytical perspective, integrating it whenever necessary with computerized interrogation routines. She has co-ordinated several research projects and published extensively on business communication, on legal language, and on scientific discourse. She has also (co-)edited several volumes (most recently, *Discourse, Ideology and Specialized Communication*, with S. Sarangi, 2007; *The Use of English in Institutional and Business Settings*, with C. Ilie, 2007; *Identities across Media and Modes: Discursive Perspectives*, with P. Catenaccio, 2009; *Discourse and Identities in Institutional, Professional and Academic Communication*, with J. Archibald, 2010; *Arbitration Awards: Generic Features and Textual Realisations* (with V.K. Bhatia and C. Degano, 2012). Her other research interests are in translation and interpreting studies, on which she has also published extensively. She is general editor (with A. Cardinaletti e F. Frasnedi) of the book series *Lingua, traduzione, didattica*.*

C. GNUTZMANN (TU Braunschweig)

„Das ist das Problem, das hinzukriegen, dass es so klingt, als hätt' es ein Native Speaker geschrieben.“ Academic writing in English as a foreign language

c.gnutzmann@tu-bs.de

The predominant use of English in scientific publications is a well-documented fact. In the natural sciences, the proportion of publications in English worldwide has been greater than 90 percent for over a decade; in the field of engineering and even in the social sciences and the humanities the figures are apparently quite similar. Thus, it comes as no surprise that in the rankings of the European Science Foundation almost all academic journals with the top grade "A" are published in English. As a consequence, anglophony is the communicative norm in almost all scientific disciplines. Since journal publications in English have become the essential indicator for research performance and assessment internationally, it seems obvious that non-native English researchers have to cope with an additional problem, namely the linguistic challenge, a fact which very often puts them at a communicative and a research disadvantage. The main research questions of a two-year project, carried out in Braunschweig and funded by the Volkswagen Foundation, are the following:

- (1) What problems and challenges do non-native researchers encounter in their preparation of research articles in English?
- (2) What strategies and resources do they deploy in order to overcome these problems, i.e. their communicative disadvantage?
- (3) How does immersion in a specific discipline influence the attitudes of researchers towards English and German as scientific languages?

The empirical part of the research is presently based on 24 interviews conducted with researchers from four disciplines (biology, German linguistics, history, mechanical engineering,) at different universities in Germany. The paper starts out by describing the research design and methodology used in the study. This is followed by an analysis and evaluation of selected interview data, and a short discussion of why, for many users, the status of English in international academic communication is better identified as a foreign language than as a lingua franca.

Claus Gnutzmann is Professor emeritus of English Language and Applied Linguistics at the University of Braunschweig. He has previously held similar posts at the University of Paderborn and the University of Hanover; he was educated at the University of Kiel, University of Stuttgart, University College London and the City University of New York. He holds an MA degree in Modern English Language from London, a Dr. phil. in Phonetics from Kiel and a second doctorate ("Habilitation") in English Linguistics from Hannover. His main research interests lie in linguistic and pedagogical grammar, language awareness, contrastive linguistics and error analysis, languages for special purposes as well as the globalisation of English and its classroom applications. He is currently involved in a research project on "Publish in English or perish in German?" Academic writing and publishing in English a foreign language", which is funded by the Volkswagen Foundation. He is one of the editors of the journal "Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen"

("Teaching and learning foreign languages"), which publishes articles in German, English and occasionally in French.

Marion KRAUSE (University of Hamburg)

Presentations on business topics in L3 Russian: What should we learn from the evaluation by natives?

marion.krause@uni-hamburg.de

Audio-visual presentations of products are a commonly employed marketing practice. In the business world, they are often held in English. But in a lot of contexts the use of the addressees' L1 language seems to be a real selling factor. For this reason, special training in foreign languages should be regarded as an indispensable component of business language teaching courses. Our empirical study on the perception and evaluation of presentations by native speakers of Russian focuses on three aspects which should have an impact on the professional language training.

Firstly, it offers a reflection on the presentation practice in the addressees' target culture; secondly, it points to the importance of general skills in presentation techniques and auditory design; and thirdly, it emphasizes the need of special language training.

On the one hand, language specific presentation training should provide students with the more general linguistic means of addressing and structuring the text genre as well as with the more special vocabulary and language structures of the concerned economic domain. On the other hand, the analysis of natives' tolerances against language errors shows that special training is required especially in phonetics - at least in a synthetic language with a complicated pronunciation and accent system as Russian is. According to this aspect of the study, the results of a previous pilot research (Krause/Loos 2008) have been confirmed by the whole.

Marion Krause is Professor of Slavic Linguistics at the University of Hamburg. She was educated at the State University of St. Petersburg, Russia. She holds research and teaching positions at the Universities of Jena, Bochum and Frankfurt am Main. From 2003 to 2009 she worked at the Department of Foreign Language Business Communication at the WU Vienna. She got her first doctorate in General Linguistics, Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistics with a thesis on linguistic factors in perception of L1 and L2/L3 (Russian-German). Her habilitation thesis in Slavic linguistics (Ruhr University Bochum) was about modality. Her main linguistic interests lie in phonetics, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. She has wide experience in empirical research. Currently, she is working in the fields of language contact, multilingualism, and perceptual linguistics.

Michael LANGNER (University of Luxemburg)

Digital media, e-learning and neuro-didactics – and (language) learning?

michael.langner@uni.lu

I will build my presentation around a number of suggestive questions as follows. In today's digital electronic environment we encounter social networks, second life, sms, chat, twitter, emails, forums, etc. all based on computers and even smartphones. We can access almost any information in a matter of seconds. But is this the beginning of the frequently cited knowledge society or merely an information society, a 'search machine society'? Do we still need knowledge or is information enough? And how do we get from information to knowledge? Which digital media can we use for (language) learning today? And what are the potential benefits? Is the most innovative tool always the best for learning? And of course there are different forms of e-learning. But how do we get from basic e-learning to blended learning and perhaps open learning environments? Why are we seeing a trend away from extreme positions (where e-learning is regarded as the solution of the constructivist approach) to suitable compromises such as earning advice as support for autonomous learning? And finally, what about language learning from a neuroscience point of view whether in terms of multitasking, multisensory input for improved memorization or in providing a real versus virtual (learning) environment? I will finish my talk with some cautious conclusions that there is a need for motivation, deep processing, attentiveness, concentration in order to succeed in learning.

Michael Langner earned his Doctorate (PhD) in Linguistics at the Albert-Ludwigs-University of Freiburg (Germany). From 1980 to 1985 he worked as an Assistant (junior lecturer) of German Linguistics at the University of Geneva/CH and from 1985 to 1998 as a Lecturer of German as a Foreign Language at the bilingual University of Freiburg/Fribourg. As a member of the Vice-Chancellor's Committee he has been involved in the development of the university's bilingualism policy as well as in concrete proposals for promoting individual bilingualism at the University of Fribourg. He organized the first and the fourth conference of Multilingual Universities 2003 at Fribourg/CH and 2010 at Luxembourg. Since 2008 he has been a visiting professor at the University of Luxembourg being responsible for the development of a concept for the trilingual university including bi-/trilingual diplomas and language tests. His work and publications focus on bi- and plurilingualism, new media for language learning, as well as evaluation and assessment.

G. LÜDI (University of Basel)

Multilingual solutions in the construction of scientific knowledge and for internal communication in businesses

Georges.Luedi@unibas.ch

Multilingualism is a controversial issue in many discussions about communication in academic contexts and in businesses. On the one hand, the choice of English as *lingua franca* is claimed to be an all-encompassing solution, empowering people to overcome diversity and promoting economic development; on the other hand, many voices make a plea for more linguistic diversity arguing that this fosters creativity, equity and, lastly, efficiency in a range of fields. We will try to show that both views are firmly anchored in institutions' culture and discourse, and that they are complementary more than competing. Empirical research about management, images and practices of linguistic diversity in businesses throughout Europe shows that English as *lingua franca* is often chosen because it is the only shared resource in constellations characterized by extreme linguistic diversity. However, the alternating (one language at a time) or simultaneous (all the languages at the same time) use of multilingual repertoires put to work by all the interlocutors in a situated manner to find local responses to practical problems is a frequent and rewarding answer to the challenge of a growing linguistic diversity too. Our interpretation is grounded in the assumption that multilingualism can no longer be considered as an addition of single languages, but as an integrated "multicompetence." This has consequences for the ways languages are taught and used as a medium of instruction.

Georges Lüdi is professor emeritus for French Linguistics, former Head of the French Department and past Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Basel University. He was responsible of various Bachelor, Master and PhD programs, and supervised more than twenty PhD and "habilitation" theses. He authored numerous scientific publications on linguistic aspects of migration, multilingualism, second language teaching and learning, workplace communication, educational language policy, etc. He conducted several large third party financed research projects with a focus on various forms of (emergent) multilingualism and language contact in Switzerland with qualitative as well as quantitative methods; from 2006 to 2011 he acted as deputy coordinator of the European DYLAN project. He has chaired the Swiss Linguistic Society and the Swiss Association for Applied Linguistics, has served as Member of the Executive Board of the International Association for Applied Linguistics AILA and has been awarded with the distinction of Officer in the Ordre national du mérite by the French Government.

Leena LOUHIALA-SALMINEN (Aalto University)

BELF as the language of global business: Implications for teaching?

leena.louhiala-salminen@aalto.fi

The paper will introduce and discuss the concept of BELF (English as the Business Lingua Franca; Business ELF) and present two research projects that have approached international business communication from a lingua franca perspective. The concept was developed in a research project conducted at the Aalto University School of Business (until 2010 Helsinki School of Economics) in Finland in 2000-2002. Our team investigated Finnish-Swedish communication in two large corporations that merged between the two countries. The findings indicated that when Finnish and Swedish business professionals used English in their interaction, both parties brought their own discourse conventions to the conversations. The business professionals were using English as a Lingua Franca (nobody's own native language) but, to some extent, their mother-tongue discursive practices and culture-specific conventions were identifiable. However, their communication was largely 'successful', basing on the communicators' knowledge and experience of the particular (business) discourse community. The second project looked at BELF communication from the point of view of communicative competence. Through an extensive survey study and related interviews we collected data to examine the communicative competence of internationally operating business practitioners and, on the basis of the findings, proposed a model of Global Communicative Competence (GCC). BELF could be seen as a new paradigm to approach the teaching of English for Business Purposes. Therefore, the paper will be concluded with a discussion of the potential implications for the teaching of business students – and business professionals – to communicate in their global activities.

Leena Louhiala-Salminen, MSc (Econ), Lic.Phil., PhD, is Professor of International Business Communication at the Aalto University School of Business (former Helsinki School of Economics), Finland. She is also Program Director of the Master's Program in International Business Communication offered by the School's Department of Communication. Her research interests include the various genres of business communication, the use of English as the business lingua franca, and corporate communication in international contexts. Recently, she has published in e.g. Public Relations Review, IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication and English for Specific Purposes.

David NEWBY (University of Graz)

From communicative competence to cognitive competence

dnewby@aon.at

During my professional lifetime, language teaching has undergone remarkable developments. Some innovations that have influenced my own teaching, expressed in the following labels and

titles, are: Communicative Language Teaching, Languages for Specific Purposes and CLIL, Learner-centred Approaches, the CEFR, Intercultural Awareness. At the same time, theoretical disciplines which feed into language teaching, either directly or indirectly, have also undergone radical changes. Of particular significance are two waves of challenges aimed at a Chomskyan theoretical framework. The first, by linguists such as Hymes and Halliday, provided impetus to the Communicative Approach, and delivered the term communicative competence, which, since the 1970s, has been widely used to characterise the goal of language learning. More recent challenges to Chomskyan theories have come from Cognitive linguists, who have provided not only a radically differing view of what language is, but also of how languages are learned. I will argue that the goal of Communicative Competence now needs to be supplemented by the complementary category of Cognitive Competence. Since 'cognitive' is used in a very specific sense within this theoretical framework, I shall outline what Cognitive Competence might mean and will indicate how an understanding of its principles will help to guide language teachers in their teaching. Further, I shall suggest that a Cognitive view in fact underlies many of the above-mentioned developments in language teaching and that its principles and insights can serve to dispel some of the dogmas and myths surrounding language teaching of recent decades.

David Newby is associate professor of linguistics and language teaching didactics and research at Graz University, Austria. He is the co-author of the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages. He is the author of school textbooks and reference grammars. His main academic interest is the theory and practice of pedagogical grammar.

Magali PAQUOT (University of Louvain-la-Neuve)

EFL writing in the disciplines: Insights from the VESPA learner corpus

magali.paquot@uclouvain.be

The presentation deals with the place of learner corpora, i.e. electronic collections of authentic language data produced by learners of a foreign/second language (Granger, 2009), in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) pedagogy and sets out to demonstrate that they have a valuable contribution to make to the field. The analysis of learner corpus data and their comparison with data from native corpora have highlighted a number of problems which non-native learners experience when writing in academic settings, e.g., lack of register awareness, phraseological infelicities, and semantic misuse (Gilquin et al.; 2007). Following a brief introduction to corpus-based analyses of learner language, I zoom in on a new international corpus project, i.e. the *Varieties of English for Specific Purposes dAtabase* (VESPA) learner corpus.¹ The aim of the project is to build a large corpus of English for Specific Purposes texts written by L2 writers from various mother tongue backgrounds in a wide range of disciplines (linguistics, business, medicine, law, biology, etc), genres (papers, reports, MA dissertations) and degrees of writer expertise in academic settings (from first-year students to PhD students). I report on a number of case studies that made use of the VESPA corpus to examine EFL learners' use of academic vocabulary, lexical

¹ <http://www.uclouvain.be/en-278321.html>

verbs, writer/reader visibility features and lexical means to express specific rhetorical functions and show how a careful corpus-based analysis of learner texts is an effective way of “operationalizing writing difficulties” (Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006: 14) in the disciplines. I round off the presentation with some pedagogical implications.

References:

- Bitchener, J., & Basturkmen, H. (2006). Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(1) : 4–18.
- Gilquin, G., Granger, S. & Paquot, M. (2007). Learner corpora: The missing link in EAP pedagogy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 6(4): 319–335.
- Granger, S. (2009). The contribution of learner corpora to second language acquisition and foreign language teaching: A critical evaluation. In K. Aijmer (ed.), *Corpora and Language Teaching*. Benjamins: Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 13-32.

Magali Paquot is a postdoctoral researcher at the Centre for English Corpus Linguistics, University of Louvain, Belgium. Her current research interests focus on academic vocabulary, phraseology, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing and pedagogical lexicography. Her latest publications include Academic Vocabulary in Learner Writing (Continuum, 2010), A Taste for Corpora (co-edited with F. Meunier, S. De Cock & G. Gilquin, Benjamins, 2011) and Electronic Lexicography (co-edited with S. Granger, Oxford University Press, in press).

Brigitte PLANKEN (Radboud University Nijmegen)

LSP research into practice: a case of “Yes, we can” or “Change we need”?

b.planken@let.ru.nl

In this presentation, I would like to discuss three points that broadly relate to how LSP research has expanded since the 1990s, as a result of technological advances and the incorporation of multiple disciplines. Firstly, I discuss how the analysis of LSP has evolved, broadening from a focus on describing language in specialist fields of knowledge (law, business, academia) to an interdisciplinary perspective that utilizes a varied arsenal of complementary (often discourse-based) approaches, involving multiple methods, data sets and specialist contexts of use. In doing so, LSP research has increasingly aimed to ‘contextualize’ specialist language use, moving from the analysis of lexico-grammatical features of text to incorporate the investigation of written and spoken discourse in specific domains as it is used in situ. Language is seen -and investigated- more and more as social behaviour. Secondly, with regard to determining the ‘specifics’ of LSP, I argue that the use of approaches informed by e.g. CA, and genre and corpus analysis, combined with ethnographic methods to determine users’ needs and ‘obstacles’, have meant that LSP studies are yielding thicker and more detailed, case-based accounts of specialist language use (and needs) that can –and should- inform LSP practitioners responsible for developing up to date materials. Yet,

the transfer from research findings to LSP teaching (materials), although perhaps obvious in theory, seems to have remained fairly limited. Thirdly, therefore, I would like to pose a question: why is this so? Does LSP research somehow fail to hit the spot? Should researchers make greater efforts to sensitize practitioners and teachers to the potential relevance of LSP analysis? Are LSP researchers sensitive (enough) to LSP practitioners' needs? How can LSP research in the future be made (more) relevant to practitioners and teachers? What areas of LSP deserve particular attention, e.g. LSP and CMC, [B]ELF as LSP?

Brigitte Planken is an Associate Professor at the Department of Communication and Information Studies/ Centre for Language Studies, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands. She teaches courses on communication research and English as a business language in the Department of Communication and Information Studies. Her research interests include English as a lingua franca for business, the effects of foreign languages in persuasive communication, intercultural negotiations, and stakeholder perceptions of CSR communications.

Hanna RISKU (University of Graz)

A sociocognitive perspective on learning languages for special purposes

hanna.risku@uni-graz.at

Cognitive approaches to language acquisition have traditionally tended to emphasize the mental processes in the mind. In the cognitivist and the early connectionist view, learning and using language are seen as manipulations of internal symbols or schemes. Yet the conceptualizations of the mind in cognitive science have seen some radical changes in recent decades. It is now being stressed that cognitive processes are dependent on and partly constituted by the interaction with the environment in which they are carried out. Thus, the object of cognitive research and the unit involved in learning languages have been extended from the brain to the body and the social and physical world. In this presentation, I will discuss the approaches of situated, embodied and extended cognition, then look at the specific context of LSP acquisition and use, followed by an examination of the consequences of the extended view of cognition for learning and teaching languages for special purposes. Specifically, I will draw attention to three aspects that seem to imply radical changes to the way LSP learning is traditionally conceptualized: the social aspect (including the social networks in which language is used and learned), the physical aspect (including artefacts that scaffold learning), and the interaction aspect (including the vast interactive capabilities active in language acquisition and use). In essence, this perspective seems to have the potential to enlarge the object, goal and process of LSP learning which can now be styled as the interaction of a coupled system comprised of human organisms and external entities.

Hanna Risku is professor of Translation Studies at the Department of Translation Studies of the University of Graz, Austria. She studied Translation Studies at the University of Tampere, Finland, and at the University of Vienna, Austria, and carried out further studies of Open and Distance

Education at the University of Gothenburg/Sweden. She is member of several scientific boards and reviewer of national and international journals, conferences, awards, funds and universities.

Previous positions: Professor of Applied Cognitive Science and Technical Communication, Head of the Department for Knowledge and Communication Management and Vice Rector of the Danube University Krems, Austria; visiting professor at the University of Aarhus, Denmark; lecturer and researcher at the University of Tampere and at the University of Skövde, Sweden; lecturer at the University of Vienna, University of Applied Sciences Wiener Neustadt, Austria, and University of Granada, Spain; President of the European Society for Technical Communication, TCeurope, head of International Relations at tekomp e.V., freelance translator and researcher.

Her research interests include cognitive scientific foundations of translation, communication, and learning (esp. situated and extended cognition), network studies, transcultural communication, translation management, computer-supported cooperative work and user-centred design and usability.

Diane SCHMITT (Nottingham Trent University)

Beyond feedback: Instruction for treating the untreatable

diane.schmitt@ntu.ac.uk

In a 2006 study on the efficacy of specific language feedback on student writing, Ferris identified two categories of error types which she labelled the “treatable” and the “untreatable”. She noted that teachers’ responses to each type of error differed with teachers providing indirect feedback, i.e. use of error correction codes or underlining, for “treatable errors”, and teachers providing direct feedback, i.e. supplying the correct form, for “untreatable errors”. In this study “untreatable errors” were errors in word choice, idiom use and sentence structure. The main significance of this finding was that while students showed short-term progress in their ability to revise their own texts based on both types of feedback, long term progress was only found for error types that received indirect feedback. Given that our ultimate goal as writing/language teachers is to improve students writing over the long term, these findings suggest that we must do much more than simply supply the correct forms for errors that have been categorized as untreatable. In this presentation, I will introduce tools and techniques that teachers and writing tutors can use to assist their students in achieving long-term progress in the development of appropriate use of lexis in their writing.

Diane Schmitt is a Senior Lecturer in EFL/TESOL at Nottingham Trent University and the deputy chair of BALEAP. She teaches on the MA in English Language Teaching and also on a range of English for Academic Purposes courses. She is the co-author of two textbooks on teaching vocabulary. She regularly presents, publishes or consults on the following areas: academic writing, plagiarism, vocabulary acquisition, language testing, materials development and the international student experience.

Norbert SCHMITT (University of Nottingham)

Vocabulary for Specific Purposes: Identification and Teaching

norbert.schmitt@nottingham.ac.uk

Language for Specific Purposes includes vocabulary for specific purposes. But the tricky question remains of how to conceptualize and identify the vocabulary which is particularly important in particular domains, and how to teach it once it has been identified. This presentation will discuss various ways specific-purpose vocabulary can be conceptualized, including as content-based 'technical vocabulary' and as a range of sub-technical 'support vocabulary' which is commonly used to contextualize the technical vocabulary in particular domains. Various methods of identifying specific-purpose vocabulary will then be discussed, including the use of LSP corpora, frequency information, expert opinion, and text-comparison. As part of the discussion, several lists of domain-specific vocabulary will be presented and critiqued. Once domain-specific vocabulary has been identified, it needs to be learned. The presentation will briefly consider how this vocabulary can best be addressed pedagogically. Explicit instruction has the advantages of relatively quick and durable learning, but is best for establishing the link between word form and its meaning. Despite the reservations of many practitioners, use of the L1 in explicit teaching can be beneficial if used carefully. A main disadvantage of explicit instruction is that it is difficult to provide all of the contextual information about words which allow them to be used appropriately and effectively (e.g. register constraints, collocation, correct derivative form), and this is particularly important in LSP contexts. To build this 'contextual' vocabulary knowledge, it seems that a large amount of repeated exposure to varying contexts is necessary, and so an effective vocabulary program must include both explicit instruction and an emphasis on increased exposure outside the classroom.

Norbert Schmitt is Professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of Nottingham. He is interested in all aspects of second language vocabulary. He is currently researching formulaic language, the interface between vocabulary and reading/listening, and the relationship between vocabulary size and depth of knowledge. His most recent book is Researching Vocabulary: A Vocabulary Research Manual (2010, Palgrave).

Mette SKOVGAARD ANDERSEN (Copenhagen Business School)

An eternal dilemma: Between LSP-knowledge and language/communication knowledge – a report from teaching the case based course "Transferring knowledge between languages"

Msa.ikk@cbs.dk

Due to economic reasons the Copenhagen Business School does no longer and since several years educate "real" (i.e. certified and state authorized) translators and interpreters in the languages German, Spanish and French, but still in English. However, CBS still hosts bachelor and master

programs where language is a key component like the master program of Cand. Ling. Merc (www.cbs.dk). This master program focuses less on the (LSP) content than on the oral and written intercultural mediation/communication and comprehension skills thereby fulfilling the explicit demands of the surroundings (i.e. business companies). In this presentation, I will take my starting point in my experiences teaching the course '*Transferring knowledge between languages*' and from this discuss if this European trend in the educational policy focusing on the output/outcome (cf. The European Qualifications Frameworks *can-do* terms) can actually put the acquisition and teaching of expert knowledge at risk (Dehnbostel 2011). Is it at all possible within the given time frame to achieve the objectives of the course and meet the demands from society or is expert knowledge and LSP training deemed to suffer from this competence based training? Thus, the presentation will discuss the eternal dilemma between form and content and present and discuss the teaching methods deriving from the case based training, like the dialogic learning (Goetz 2007; Ruf/Witzer 2012)

References:

Badr Goetz, Nadja (2007): Das Dialogische Lernmodell. Grundlagen und Erfahrungen zur Einführung einer komplexen didaktischen Innovation in den gymnasialen Unterricht. München: Meidenbauer.

Dehnbostel, Peter (2011). *Qualifikationsrahmen: Lernerergebnis- und Outcomeorientierung zwischen Bildung und Ökonomie*. In: Magazin erwachsenenbildung.at; Ausgabe 14. Graz: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur.

Ruf, Urs/Winter, Felix (2012). Dialogisches Lernen: die gemeinsame Suche nach Qualitäten. Zeitschrift für Inklusion 1-2. Zeitschrift für Inklusion-online.at.

Mette Skovgaard Andersen is an Associate professor at the Department of International Business Communication at Copenhagen Business School. Her primary research interest has been within conceptualizations and the interrelation between language and culture. Based on cognitive linguistics she has for instance investigated how phenomena like 'conjuncture' seem to be very differently conceptualized within a German and a Danish context. Recently, she has been interested in "ideas about language(s)" and their circulation. In this connection, she and a colleague have investigated how employees at ministerial level regard their language use and needs and she has herself been doing research within the perception of language(s) in the Danish secondary school 'Gymnasiet' having increased her interest in didactics.

Eva VETTER (University of Vienna)

Teaching language(s) in the context of superdiversity. Risks and opportunities for institutions of tertiary education

eva.vetter@univie.ac.at

Superdiversity, i.e. the diversification of diversity, is characterized by an extraordinary variety of resources and experiences, as well as by unpredictability. It describes the wider language policy framework in which the teaching and learning of languages at universities is embedded. Such a perspective has various implications: it leads to new questions and possible answers; it carries risks and creates opportunities. By relating the language learning context to language(s) and language users, this paper will discuss three central questions within the context of language policy:

- Is multilingualism a possible answer to conditions created by superdiversity and who benefits from it?
- How can the heterogeneity and variability of languages be accommodated in the classroom?
- What is the appropriate pedagogical framework that would allow different subject positions in a specific context?

These issues will be addressed by setting them against the background of European language policies and their ideological orientations. Discussing the benefits of multilingualism leads one to question the 'cost effectiveness' of languages as well as the monoglossic normativity that in the past few decades, in Europe, has become embodied in the English only position. The heterogeneity and variability of languages as well as the subjective positions adopted provide opportunities for a more detailed didactic discussion. These positions form part of concepts that have been far more prominently represented in scholarly debates than in language curricula (e.g., intercomprehension or functional multilingualism). The discussion will be rounded off by providing initial, if only partial, answers to the challenges of superdiversity.

Professor Eva Vetter graduated in Romance Languages and Geography and has taught French from 1991 to 2010. At the same time she has been involved in various research projects. She holds a PhD in French and Applied Linguistics. Her research interests focus upon multilingualism with respect to linguistic minorities, historical multilingualism, language policy and language teaching and learning. From 2006 – 2010 she elaborated on theories and methods of multilingualism within the EC founded Network of Excellence LINEE (Languages in a Network of European Excellence). Beyond the focus on multilingualism, her research concerns text and discourse analysis, social network, francophonie and teacher education. Eva Vetter is currently Secretary of the Austrian Branch of AILA (Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée: verbal, Verband der Angewandten Linguistik Österreichs), Co-Editor of the International Journal of Multilingualism and director of the Centre for Research into Language Teaching and Learning at Vienna University (<http://fdz-sprachen.univie.ac.at>).

Robert WILKINSON (Maastricht University Language Centre)

English-medium instruction: Implications and consequences for multilingual policy

b.wilkinson@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Higher education has changed considerably over the past quarter of a century. Education has become more harmonized, more comparable, and more competitive. Harmonization stems from political decisions, such as the Bologna Declaration, comparability from the attention to matters such as rankings and quality assurance, and competition partly from the needs to recruit students and staff from diverse backgrounds and cultures. One area where these trends are most noticeable is the language of instruction. More and more institutions are offering programmes in English. The reasons for the rise of English-medium instruction (EMI) are well known (Wächter & Maiworm, 2008): to attract foreign students, to fit domestic students for the international labour market, to profile the institution, to provide development aid. This paper elaborates on the changing reasons that impelled one institution, Maastricht University, to move gradually from Dutch-medium education to largely English-medium. EMI has been deployed principally in business and economics, and the sciences, but it is also noticeable in programmes that address an international dimension, for example European Law, European Studies, Global Governance. Naturally, there is criticism of this trend towards EMI, often grounded on real or perceived domain loss for the L1 and risk of decline of multilingual diversity and the perceived lack of multilingual competence among students. It is instructive to examine the implications of EMI, both in the shorter and longer term. The impacts occur at varying levels, some of which may warrant policy decisions. In this contribution I will expound on the context of EMI at Maastricht University in the light of the university policy of bilingualism. Through examples from practice in different programmes, especially business and economics and health, I hope to identify good practice with respect to EMI. However, what good practice is depends on the education structure in place. Thus, ultimately it depends too on the strategy policy of the institution.

Wächter, B. & Maiworm, F. (2008). English-taught programmes in European higher education. Bonn: Lemmens. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education.

Robert (Bob) Wilkinson has been working for Maastricht University since the early 1980s. His main activity has been in training academic writing, especially for PhD researchers and staff. Together with others, he devised a programme in the early 1980s, particularly for biomedical and health researchers, and variants and updates of that programme are still running. He has worked with researchers in a wide range of disciplines, notably in medicine, healthcare, economics, business studies, educational sciences. His current position is Senior Teacher at Maastricht University Language Centre. Besides working at Maastricht University, he also delivers programmes for the Open University of the Netherlands. In addition, he has run international courses in Greece, Spain, Belgium, Germany, Hungary, Russia, and Ukraine. Bob Wilkinson has published around 50 papers in various international publications, and was a founding member of an international association (NELLE, Networking English Language Learning in Europe) in 1989. He served on its board, as

treasurer, and organized several conferences in Maastricht. In 2003 he organized the first conference on Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (ICLHE), repeated this in 2006, setting up an ICLHE Association in 2010 (<http://www.iclhe.org>). He is organizing a further conference of the Association in 2013 (<http://conference.iclhe.org>). A graduate from the University of Ulster, Bob Wilkinson studied at the University of Edinburgh.

NEXT SYMPOSIUM ON INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COMMUNICATION:

November 21-23, 2013

DISCOURSE AT/ON/AS WORK

PREVIOUS SYMPOSIA ON INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COMMUNICATION:

November 29-30, 2008: Methodological Issues in Economic and Business Terminology

June 11-12, 2009: Linguistic Approaches to Intercultural Business Communication

March 24-26, 2010: Discourse and Organizations: Multidisciplinary Perspectives

April 6-8, 2011: Dictionaries and Beyond