An analysis of student persuasive impromptu speeches: A systemic functional linguistic approach

Jeremy Lockwood
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd

Part of the Linguistics Commons

Recommended Citation
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/15759

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.
An analysis of student persuasive impromptu speeches: A systemic functional linguistic approach

by

Jeremy Lockwood

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Major: Teaching English as a Second Language/Applied Linguistics (English for Specific Purposes)

Program of Study Committee:
Tammy Slater, Major Professor
Gulbahar Beckett
Luke LeFebvre

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
2016

Copyright © Jeremy Lockwood, 2016. All rights reserved.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Systemic Functional Linguistic Approaches to Determining Differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics and Assessment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Speech Assessment in the Basic Course in Communication</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Rubrics and Systemic Functional Linguistics</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Systemic Functional Linguistics and Developmental Path</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Expectations of the Genre</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Data</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Procedure</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 4 RESULTS</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 RQ#1: What are the linguistic features of cohesion that appear in effective and ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 Reference</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective speeches’ use of pronouns in discourse markers, informality, and with unclear referent</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective speeches’ use of pronouns with clear referent facilitating cohesion</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2 Lexical Cohesion</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content mismatch with repeated words in ineffective speeches</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition used as a resource for cohesion in effective speeches</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy and mismatch in context in ineffective speeches</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synonymy used sparingly for cohesive and interpersonal effect in effective speeches ........................................ 52

4.1.3 Conjunctions ................................................................................................................................. 54

Additive conjunctions to signal main points in effective speeches ............................................. 55
Additive conjunctions used to connect clauses rather than for cohesion in ineffective speeches ........................................... 57
Multi-resource conjunctions as redundancy in ineffective speeches ............................................. 58
Multi-resource conjunctions as potential disfluency in effective speeches ...................................... 59
Temporal/sequential .............................................................................................................................. 61
Temporal/sequential conjunctions and mismatch with logical sequencing in ineffective speeches ........................................... 61
Temporal/sequential pattern discontinued in effective speech G1 ............................................. 62
Causal .................................................................................................................................................. 63
Causal conjunctions used in circular arguments in ineffective speeches ............................................. 63
Causal conjunctions used successfully in effective speeches ................................................................. 64
Higher use of continuatives in ineffective speeches ................................................................. 65

4.2 RQ#2: How are theme/rheme progressions developed in effective and ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches ......................................................................................................................... 66

4.2.1 Successful thematic development in effective speeches through information flow ................................................................. 67
4.2.2 Failure to fully achieve thematic development in ineffective speeches ........................................... 71

4.3 RQ#3: How is the language reflected in the rubric used for planning and evaluation ................................................................. 76

4.3.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................................... 76
4.3.2 Organization ..................................................................................................................................... 78
4.3.3 Conclusion ........................................................................................................................................ 80

CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .................................................................................... 83

5.1 Limitations ......................................................................................................................................... 87
5.2 Implications ......................................................................................................................................... 88

5.2.1 Implications for teachers and designers .................................................................................... 88
5.2.2 Future Directions ............................................................................................................................. 89

REFERENCES ........................................................................................................................................... 91

APPENDIX A. UNMARKED SPEECHES G1-G3 and B1-B3 ................................................................. 95

APPENDIX B. IMPROMPTU SPEECH ASSESSMENT RUBRIC (LeFebvre, 2015) ................................................................. 99
## List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1</td>
<td>The mode continuum (Jones, 1996)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1</td>
<td>Public Speaking Competency Rubric (Schreiber et al., 2012)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.2</td>
<td>Four common arguing genres in student academic writing (Coffin, 2004)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.1</td>
<td>Thematic Progression in Speech G1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.2</td>
<td>Thematic Progression in Speech G2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.3</td>
<td>Thematic Progression in Speech G3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.4</td>
<td>Thematic Progression in Speech B1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.5</td>
<td>Thematic Progression in Speech B2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.6</td>
<td>Thematic Progression in Speech B3</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 “Circumstances of the Four Main Registers in Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English” (Biber et al., 2002, p. 4) ......................... 4

Table 1.2 Excerpt from Impromptu Rubric in A Speechmaker’s Reference (adapted from LeFebvre, 2015) .......................................................... 5

Table 4.1 Types and Tokens for Each Group of Speeches .......................... 35
Table 4.2 The Use of Fillers in the Six Speeches ........................................ 36
Table 4.3 Measures of Lexical Density ...................................................... 38
Table 4.4 Cohesive Devices Normed to 100 Words .................................. 39
Table 4.5 Lexical Cohesion Counts Normed to 100 Words ....................... 45
Table 4.6 Repetition of Words in Speech B1 ............................................ 46
Table 4.7 Repetition of Words in Speech B3 ............................................ 47
Table 4.8 Conjunction Counts Normed to 100 Words ............................. 54
Table 4.9 Continuative Conjunction Counts Normed to 100 Words .......... 65
Table 4.10 Levels of Achievement for Evaluating Introductions ................. 76
Table 4.11 Levels of Achievement for Evaluating Organizations ................. 79
Table 4.12 Levels of Achievement for Evaluating Conclusions ................ 81
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Tammy Slater, and my committee members, Gulbahar Beckett, and Luke LeFebvre, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research.

In addition, I would like to thank my family, friends, and colleagues for being supportive and for being a source of motivation to continually do more during my time at Iowa State University. Thank you.
Utilizing a textual analysis from a systemic functional linguistic perspective, this exploratory discourse analysis investigates the cohesive resources and thematic development involved in three effective and three ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches. The organizational and structural aspects of the assessment rubric used in evaluating these speeches are analyzed as well in an effort to connect examples in the language of the speeches to the more vague and abstract descriptors of the rubric. Key findings show that the effective persuasive impromptu speeches better involve cohesive resources than the ineffective ones particularly with reference, lexical cohesion, and conjunction. The ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches used more resources of certain types of cohesive devices; however, some of these resources were not used appropriately or as successfully as in the sample of effective speeches. Implications for teachers and rubric designers include (1) the importance of deliberate choices of cohesive language to appropriately signal the relationships between ideas, which can be brought into the classroom to promote successful thematic development and organization; (2) the potential value in using examples in rater training to illustrate differences in levels of achievement; and (3) the potential need to reconsider subjective assessment rubric descriptors to allow students and instructors to maximize their potential in performing and in providing feedback.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In a typical basic course in communication, students are frequently required to develop and produce a number of speeches from two styles: extemporaneous and impromptu. For each style of speech, students are allowed a specific amount of preparation time; however, the impromptu speech has a characteristically shorter preparation time (six minutes in Iowa State University’s introductory courses), and because of this, the language found in the impromptu speech may more closely reflect the students’ natural choice of oral language for the task. Impromptu speaking was defined by Ford-Brown (2014) as a “method of delivery that has very little, if any, preparation or rehearsal [and] if any outline is used, it is simply notes jotted down quickly” (p. 223). Other characteristics of this style of speaking include a basic organizational strategy, simple language, and a lack of solid evidence (Ford-Brown, 2014). Speakers required to deliver in an impromptu style are advised to write and organize key words or ideas (time permitting), to limit remarks to two or three points, and to provide some sort of evidence to support the main points (Ford-Brown, 2014). Instances where one might use this method of delivery may include “answering questions [publicly], offer information or dispute an issue in a meeting, and when [one is] asked to address an audience at a moment’s notice” (Ford-Brown, 2014, p. 223).

Another application for impromptu speaking was presented by Ardito (1999) who discussed the role of impromptu speaking in training interpreters. In the article the author established a line of research about impromptu speaking and was able to identify some of the features of impromptu speeches that may facilitate comprehension, including sentence segmentation, prosody, and redundancy. Further, the author commented on strategies that
speakers may use when delivering an impromptu speech to adapt to the audience. These included some of the characteristics listed above, but the actions would be done in response to feedback from the audience. In connecting back to the topic of using impromptu speaking for training interpreters, Ardito commented that the ability to interpret is connected to the “predictability of the discourse structure,” meaning that speeches adhering to a consistent structure also facilitate interpretation of the speech (Ardito, 1999, p. 182). With the importance of structure in mind for comprehension, Ardito stated that the “greater spontaneity with which impromptu speeches were presented was indicated as the factor which facilitated their comprehension of the message, obviously a prerequisite for the correct reformulation of any type of speech in a target language” (Ardito, 1999, p. 183). Ardito also claimed that in training interpreters, the methodologies for “consecutive and simultaneous interpreting does not reflect real working conditions” where attention tended to be on reformulating written language into oral language potentially hindering “flexibility and ability to adapt to various speech types” (Ardito, 1999, p. 187).

Within the area of impromptu speeches in the basic communication course at Iowa State University, there is a general structure that must be adhered to in order to meet the expectations of the speech and for grading purposes, but within this structure there remains some freedom to the approach the students take and the organizational pattern they choose as well as the type of language they use. During the six minutes of preparation time, the student is allowed to develop a short speech lasting between one and two minutes on one of two topics provided for them as described in the course syllabus and impromptu rubric. Jones (1996 as cited in New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 2003) shows a mode continuum with the opposing ends: “most spoken-like” and “most written-like”; there
are examples provided between the continuum’s two poles with informal face-to-face chat and action discourse as most spoken-like, and spoken information reports, language as reflection, and reading aloud as most written like (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 2003, p. 21). The current study posits that impromptu speeches have language features that may place them in a different position on this mode continuum than other spoken types of discourse.

![Mode Continuum Diagram](image)

**Figure 1.1. The mode continuum (Jones, 1996)**

Table 1.1. “Circumstances of the Four Main Registers in *Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*” (Biber et al., 2002, p. 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Academic English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactivity and real-time production</strong></td>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Restricted to fictional dialog</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared situation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main communicative purpose/content</td>
<td>Personal communication</td>
<td>Pleasure reading</td>
<td>Information/evaluation</td>
<td>Argumentation/explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Wide-public</td>
<td>Wide-public</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Biber et al.’s table on the major registers contains one spoken register and three written registers. The Biber et al. visual differs from Jones’s in that Jones’s suggests variation within the spoken mode. The point of discussing these two visuals is to show that despite differing linguistic perspectives, there is commonality in the view that there is a continuum in the varying social purposes for language as well as some overlap toward Biber et al.’s written registers and Jones’s more written-like spoken language. Comparing Jones’s (1996) mode continuum with the possible situations necessitating impromptu delivery, as well as with the rubric used to evaluate impromptu speeches in the basic course in communication at Iowa State University (an excerpt from which is shown below), one can see that the language of speeches potentially earning top marks may exhibit a mixture of conversational language features as well as features of written language.
Table 1.2. Excerpt from impromptu rubric in *A Speechmaker’s Reference* (adapted from LeFebvre, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Choice and Vocal</th>
<th>Language is exceptionally clear, economical, imaginative and vivid; completely free from bias, grammatical errors and inappropriate usage. Excellent use of vocal variation, intensity, pacing, and pauses; vocal expression natural and enthusiastic; avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).</th>
<th>Language appropriate to the goals of the presentation; no conspicuous errors in grammar, no evidence of bias. Good vocal variation and pace; vocal expression suited to assignment; tone generally has a conversational quality; few if any fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).</th>
<th>Language selection adequate; some errors in grammar, language at times muddled (e.g., jargon, slang, awkward structure). Demonstrates some vocal variation; enunciates clearly and speaks audibly; monotone at times, generally avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).</th>
<th>Grammar and syntax need to be improved as can level of language sophistication; occasionally biased. Sometimes uses voice too soft or articulation too indistinct for listeners to comfortably hear; often uses fillers (e.g., um, uh, like); pace difficult to follow or inappropriate for audience.</th>
<th>Many errors in grammar and syntax, extensive use of jargon, slang, sexist/racist terms or miscommunications. Speaks inaudibly; enunciates poorly; speaks in monotone; poor pacing; distracts listeners with fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic Adaptation</td>
<td>Topic engages audience; topic is well adapted, worthwhile, timely, and presents information in an interesting manner to the audience.</td>
<td>Topic is appropriately adapted to the audience and situation and provides some useful information to the audience.</td>
<td>Topic needs further adaptation; provides scant new information to audience.</td>
<td>Topic is not adapted; feels too trivial, too complex, or inappropriate for audience.</td>
<td>A single topic cannot be deduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Very well organized; main points are clear, mutually exclusive and directly related to thesis and main points are previewed in the introduction; transitions between main points exhibit exceptional use of connectives; movement between points is effortless for the audience.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern is evident, main points are apparent, transitions are present between main points.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern is somewhat evident; main points are present but not mutually exclusive or exactly as previewed; transitions are present but not maximally effective.</td>
<td>Speech did not flow well; speech was not logically organized; transitions are present but not well formed.</td>
<td>No organizational pattern; no transitions; sounded as if information was randomly presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the basic course in communication, there remains some debate as to what the basic course means or what best characterizes it; however, with its place in general education at many U.S. colleges and universities (Engleberg, Emanuel, Van Horn, & Bodary, 2008; Valenzano, 2013 as cited in Morreale, Myers, Backlund, & Simonds, 2015), a 2015 survey of the basic course showed that 60.8% of students at the two- and four-year institutions take a public speaking course, and 27% take a hybrid course consisting of public speaking, interpersonal skills, and small group communication (LeFebvre, 2017; Morreale et al., 2015).

The graduate teaching assistants, or GTAs, for this course, including this study’s researcher, have noticed that there is a noticeable variation between good speeches and speeches that fall below expectations both impressionistically and in terms of the rubric. In evaluating the impromptu speeches, the rubric used is mostly straightforward with a focus on the presence/absence of the expected stages and organizational aspects; however, the speeches that tend to achieve top marks not only follow the required guidelines, but appeal to the subjective nature of the criteria of the highest levels of achievement, the reverse of which can also be said of the lower achieving speeches (Schreiber et al., 2012). But what linguistic features appear to be characteristic of those speeches that receive top marks, and how do they relate to the grading criteria? This question is at the heart of this study and will be investigated from a systemic functional linguistics (SFL) perspective with attention to genre and cohesion.

Genres, as they are characterized by Martin and Rose (2008), are “staged, goal oriented social processes. Staged because it usually takes us more than one step to reach our goals; goal oriented because we feel frustrated if we don’t accomplish the final steps; social
because writers shape their texts for readers of particular kinds” (p. 6). As genre relates to the speeches analyzed in this paper, one can fit persuasive impromptu speeches into persuasive or arguing genres. Martin and Rose provide details on three arguing genres that seem to be closest to what students tend to produce in their persuasive impromptu speeches: expositions, discussions, and challenges. Expositions are further divided into two types: hortatory and analytical. Both are characterized by having a thesis and arguments supporting that thesis; however, it is the thesis that helps determine the type of exposition. Hortatory expositions “persuade to” and analytical expositions “persuade that” (Martin, 1989, p. 17). Expositions are characterized as being one-sided or as arguing for one potentially correct position. Similarly, discussions can be separated into the two types: hortatory (persuading to) and analytical (persuading that); however, discussions may contain two or more preferred outcomes that are being argued (Coffin, 2004). Challenges differ a bit from expositions and discussions in that challenges serve as a rebuttal to an existing claim, presenting a “problematic interpretation that needs demolishing” then refuting that view (Martin & Rose, 2008, p. 137).

One aspect that this thesis will address is cohesive devices from a functional grammar perspective. Collerson (1994) describes functional grammar as an approach that “is concerned with how language works to achieve various purposes” taking “account of how the contexts in which language is used and the purposes of the users give rise to particular texts” (p. vii). He commented that a functional approach to grammar further differs from traditional grammar in its relevance particularly to spoken language (Collerson, 1994). In assessing and analyzing speeches that rely on structure, it is worthwhile to consider the strategies that speakers use to organize their speeches. Collerson defined and presented
examples of some of the main cohesive devices: reference, ellipsis and substitution, lexical cohesion, and conjunction. Reference contains pronouns, demonstratives, and comparisons which can be used to refer to something introduced earlier in a text. Ellipsis and substitution can be used as “the range of shared meaning is expanded [and] it becomes unnecessary for every component of meaning to be explicitly mentioned again and again” (Collerson, 1994, p. 129). Ellipsis is where something is left out entirely, for example, in an interaction:

Person 1: Did you go fishing?
Person 2: I did!

It can be assumed that person 2 meant I did go fishing! Substitution is where something is replaced by a substitute, for example, in an interaction:

Person 1: I am going fishing.
Person 2: So am I.

In the case above, person 2 substitutes so for going fishing. Within lexical cohesion, there are different relationships that lexical items can have with each other to create cohesion: repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, and collocation. Repetition occurs when a word is repeated in a text to refer to the same thing. Synonymy occurs when two words have the same meaning in a text. Antonymy occurs when words of opposite meanings are used cohesively. Hyponymy is the relationship of members of a class to the whole class, or a specific-general relationship, for example, pets is a hyponym of animal which is the hypernym. Meronymy is a part-whole relationship such as fin, gill, mouth, and tail are meronyms of fish with fish being the holonym. Collocation is when certain words tend to occur in the same context, making the words themselves collocates such as fish and chips, or oven and bake. Additionally, in the category of resources for lexical cohesion, grammatical metaphor can be included. Grammatical metaphor, as described by Halliday (as cited in
Martin, 1989), is an incongruence between meaning and form, which typically occurs as a nominalization, or the transformation of items that are expected to occur as “verbs, prepositions, adjectives, conjunctions, and modals into nouns” (Martin, 1989, p. 30).

Conjunctions contain additive, temporal, causal, adversative, and continuatives. Common additive conjunctions include words like and, or, and in addition connecting items together. Typical temporal conjunctions include words like then, firstly, and meanwhile creating an order chronologically or by sequencing an argument. Causal conjunctions include words like then, if, because, and therefore. Resources such as but, however, and nevertheless constitute adversative conjunctions. Lastly, the continuative conjunctions include words like anyway, well, and so acting like a discourse marker signaling that the speaker is not done with their turn (Collerson, 1994).

A second aspect of this thesis concerns coherence, which is investigated through theme/rheme and thematic progression. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) defined theme as “the point of departure of the message; it is that which locates and orients the clause within its context,” thus in English, the theme comes first in the clause (p. 64). The remainder of the message, following the theme, is the rheme (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Identifying the manner in which theme and rheme pattern out in the discourse allows one to analyze thematic progression and thus the text’s line of meaning.

The motivation for the current research lies in being able to identify the linguistic features that appear to be characteristic of the high achieving speeches and to connect examples of language with the vague and abstract grading criteria. This is at the heart of the current research. With the context and overall problem established as well as some of the key terminology and concepts, this paper will now cover some of the relevant literature
presenting SFL analyses of written and spoken language from varying approaches and with varying goals including discourse analysis and evaluation. Literature included will also address the use of rubrics and how language is assessed therein.

The current research is significant for its interdisciplinary applications—teaching English as a second language (TESL), teaching speech in the basic course in communication, and for more general applications such as interviews and addressing others publicly. Drawing attention to effective and ineffective uses of cohesive language by providing concrete examples may serve a larger role than merely an application in the classroom, but to provide guidance to students that may help throughout their professional and personal life as well.

This thesis contains five chapters. Chapter two consists of a literature review followed by chapter three, which will be a description of the methodology of the current study including information on the study, data, and procedure. Chapter four will present the results of the research with responses to each research question as well as a discussion of the findings. The final chapter will summarize the current study, state limitations, then provide directions for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature reviewed in this chapter is separated into subtopics that were useful for determining the direction for the research, the linguistic features to analyze, the method for analyzing the data, and justification for the current study. The subtopics that are discussed are SFL approaches to determining effectiveness in texts, SFL and assessment, speech assessment in the basic course in communication, rubrics and SFL, SFL and developmental path, and expectations of the genre. These subtopics help set the context for the current study by providing literature that shows the applications of SFL analyses as well as the current method of assessment in the basic course. This literature review demonstrates a gap in the existing research for systemic functional linguistics and the basic course in communication.

Systemic Functional Linguistic Approaches to Determining Differences in Texts’ Effectiveness

This study approaches the analysis of language from systemic functional linguistics (SFL), and more specifically the textual metafunction via a textual analysis. Derewianka and Jones (2010) described two major sets of linguistic resources are involved in the textual—theme (coherence) and cohesion, which are at the core of the current research. SFL was described by Halliday and Martin (1993) as “oriented to the description of language as a resource for meaning rather than a system of rules” and focusing on “relations between texts and social contexts than on texts as decontextualized structural entities” (Halliday & Martin, 1993, p. 22). A functional model “is interested in what language choices are available within any particular situation, and in which choices are more likely to result in an effective text which achieves its purpose” (Derewianka, 1990, p. 17). In comparing instances of the same
mode of persuasion, it seemed appropriate to investigate the resources used to connect the language of successful speeches and to investigate the uses of SFL in assessing language.

Jones (2010) looked at issues non-native speakers of English have in using logical connectives, the negative effects of improper use of these connectives in writing, and the use of connectives in native and expert writers. The author attributed a number of causes for overuse and misuse of logical connectors such as complexity of logical relations of items and preference of language learners and novice writers to use connectives sentence-initially, potentially affecting thematic development and information flow. In the discussion of the article, Jones argued for the need for a shift in second language pedagogy, particularly academic writing, to focus on causal relations realized by verbs. This idea of drawing attention to verb groups may be helpful in the classroom to facilitate the development of academic writing; however, with the tendency of learners to misuse and overuse conjunctions to signal logical relationships perhaps it would also be beneficial to draw attention to those features by providing explicit instruction and specific examples displaying proper, effective use of those conjunctions. This may also contribute to a more versatile language learner by providing them with more resources for creating meaning.

Systemic Functional Linguistics and Assessment

Research has been done using the SFL-informed approaches to analyze differences in discourse in classrooms as well as interviews. While most of the literature has analyzed learner language, the Knowledge Framework (KF) has also been applied to native English speaking students to assess development and effectiveness. For example, Mohan (1998) analyzed the knowledge structures present in oral proficiency interviews (OPIs) for international teaching assistants in question-and-answer interactions. Mohan’s analysis was
in response to the negative aspects of OPIs with regard to the focus usually being on sentence-level accuracy. Because the KF looks beyond sentence level and more toward the text and discourse level, it seemed appropriate to provide a “functional view of the language and discourse, and [a look] at oral proficiency in academic contexts” where the initial assessment of the OPI failed (Mohan, 1998, p. 199). Mohan stated that the excerpts analyzed were four of eight OPIs that were rated by a single, trained interviewer, and were analyzed for the use of knowledge structures, and each of the excerpts used in the chapter were discussed in terms of what was effective and what failed to be. This methodology in Mohan’s study helped inform the decision to analyze a subset of data based on the recommendations of a trained expert in speech communication to ensure that the sample analyzed will be representative of effective and ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches.

Mohan (2001) discussed links between knowledge structures, KSs, and genres. The example Mohan cited looked at 10 ESL students and 10 native English speaking university students, and it analyzed the language that was used to accomplish the task of creating a classification essay based on information in a graphic chart. The results were illustrated by two excerpts, one from a grade 10 ESL student—basic writer—and one from a native speaker university student—skilled writer. Both writers used basically the same information, but they “shaped it into discourse in very different ways” (p. 119). The analysis of the two excerpts showed that the basic writer “simply follows the chart line by line, and writes a sentence for each line,” while the skilled writer “starts with a general introductory paragraph, then gives a more limited generalization, and then brings in the specific chart information, creating a discourse pattern which suits the requirements of the classification essay genre” (p. 119). The use of language also varied in the writers’ attempts at creating cohesion—the basic
writer created “cohesion by using also repetitively, whereas the skilled writer create[d] cohesion through lexical harmony as in verb phrases” (p.119). Mohan suggested that the language can be investigated much “further by drawing on work in systemic functional linguistics” which would allow for “detailed discussions of genres, discourse ‘texture’ (theme, information focus and cohesion)” (p. 119). These findings and Mohan’s commentary on the significance of SFL helped motivate this study by suggesting that the two examples’ different cohesive resources may affect the perception of effectiveness with the more advanced writer’s essay better adhering to the requirements of the classification genre.

Huang and Morgan (2003) used an SFL-informed approach to analyze meaning, form, and function in ESL students’ writing to evaluate writing development and content learning. This article looked at classification texts, using the KF for evaluation purposes. The participants in the study were 35 students between two classes, and the data analyzed consisted of the students’ interactions as well as drafts of their written work. Huang and Morgan approached the analysis of the texts by first “identify[ing] the KS that the text represents”; second, “present[ing] a graphic representation of the KS expressed in the text”; third, “specify[ing] the main semantic relationship relationship(s) that serve to construct the KS in the text”; and fourth, identify the key linguistic features that express the KS in the text, with particular attention to generic reference, transitivity processes, conjunction and lexis” (p. 244). The article sought to fill the gap in the research on “the grammatical and discourse features of particular kinds of school writing so that classroom teachers may gain a better understanding of the intrinsic relationships between meaning wording in academic texts and thus be better able to help students use the grammatical resources available to them for expressing meaning in writing” (Huang & Morgan, 2003, p. 238). The researchers’ use of
graphic representations of the students’ writing showed how classification knowledge was constructed; however, Huang and Morgan took it further by using a knowledge structure analysis to determine linguistic sophistication. The researchers’ use of the KS analysis allowed them to look beyond sentence-level errors, to which evaluation using traditional grammar might have limited them. The authors stated that with identifying “discrete errors in grammar...it would be difficult to see the fundamental differences between the two texts: both contain numerous grammatical mistakes” (p. 248). Huang and Morgan found that the third draft of a student’s writing might “contain more mistakes, especially with the increased use of relative clauses in the discourse...”; however, “those with knowledge of classification discourse in science may well agree that draft 3 in linguistically more sophisticated” (p. 248). Additionally, they found that the knowledge structures analysis allowed for identification of “students’ weaknesses in a specific textual contexts and thus provide[d] helpful guidance to diagnostic assessment and instructional intervention” (p. 256). The use of the Knowledge Framework analysis as an evaluation tool for student work in Huang and Morgan’s (2003) research, in addition to the use of the Knowledge Framework to assess oral proficiency exams in Mohan (1998), affected what will ultimately be analyzed in the student persuasive impromptu speeches—moving beyond what the students are saying toward how the students are holding their thoughts together in their speeches, and how this can be elucidated more clearly in the rubric.

Speech Assessment in the Basic Course in Communication

Schreiber et al. (2012) provided a look into issues regarding rubrics used in the basic course in communication as well as documentation of their process of developing the Public Speaking Competence Rubric (PSCR). The researchers began by establishing the landscape
of rubrics used in assessing speeches, commenting that their research aimed to “move to the next generation of public speaking competence assessment via the development of a universally intelligible public speaking rubric that can be used by faculty and students across disciplines” (p. 207). This goal was motivated by Morreale and Backlund’s (2007) call for assessment practices to include more “precise and detailed strategies” (Morreale & Backlund, 2007, p. 48). The two types of rubrics that were discussed were the two used to assess public speaking performance: rating scales and descriptive rubrics (Schreiber et al. 2012). The researchers described rating scale rubrics as including “a list of the key competencies along with a rating scale to demonstrate a degree or level of aptitude” with indications of performance with numeric values (i.e., a score from 1 to 5 points), descriptors (i.e., good, fair, poor), indication of “relative presence or absence of a behavior (i.e., often, sometimes, rarely),” or some other indication corresponding to another criterion such as a grade (p. 211). Though these types of rubrics are easy to create and use, a significant drawback is that the levels of performance are not clearly described, as can be seen: “highly effective, effective, and moderately effective” (p. 211). The authors saw the lack of clarity as a potential source for inter-rater variation and subjectivity. Additionally, rating scales did not provide students with adequate feedback to help them improve their performance; thus the researchers found rating scales as unfit for their pedagogical and assessment goals (Schreiber et al., 2012). The other type of rubric described in the article was the descriptive or analytic rubrics (Schreiber et al., 2012). Descriptive rubrics “replace[d] the checkboxes of rating scale rubrics with brief descriptions of the performances that merit each possible rating” (Suskie, 2009, p. 142). These rubrics outlined the differences between advanced and proficient performances (Schreiber et al. 2012). These rubrics are valuable when major decisions are made based on
the assessments, and they are helpful in being objective in evaluating performances (Schreiber et al., 2012); however, the disadvantage of descriptive rubrics is the negative effect they have on efficiency in grading despite the benefits of the detailed feedback provided. The study that was presented in the article consisted of the researchers' Public Speaking Competence Rubric being used to assess informative and persuasive speeches. The rubric that was used is shown below.

**Figure 2.1. Public Speaking Competency Rubric (Schreiber et al., 2012).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance standard</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Deficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selects a topic that engages and maintains audience interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulates an introduction that grabs audience attention and generates interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses an effective organizational pattern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a clear and memorable conclusion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively uses vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Deficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic is appropriate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational pattern is clear and memorable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points were generally supported using an adequate mix of sources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion lacks clarity; speech ends abruptly and without closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance standard</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Deficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locates, synthesizes, and employs compelling supporting materials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a careful choice of words</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Deficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All key points are well supported with a variety of credible materials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate summary of points provides a clear and memorable conclusion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language is exceptionally clear, imaginative and vivid; completely free from bias, grammar errors, and inappropriate usage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language appropriate to the goals of the presentation; no conspicuous errors in grammar; no evidence of bias</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and syntax need to be improved as can level of language sophistication is occasionally biased</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Supporting materials are nonexistent or not cited | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |
| No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |

| Supporting materials are nonexistent or not cited | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |
| No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |

| Supporting materials are nonexistent or not cited | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |
| No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |

| Supporting materials are nonexistent or not cited | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |
| No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |

| Supporting materials are nonexistent or not cited | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |
| No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |

| Supporting materials are nonexistent or not cited | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |
| No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure | 4        | 3          | 2     | 1       | 0         |
Figure 2.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance standard</th>
<th>The student...</th>
<th>Advanced 4</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Basic 2</th>
<th>Minimal 1</th>
<th>Deficient 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Demonstrates nonverbal behavior that supports the verbal message</td>
<td>Posture, gestures, facial expressions and eye contact well developed, natural, and display high levels of poise and confidence</td>
<td>Postures, gestures and facial expressions are suitable for speech; speaker appears confident</td>
<td>Some reliance on notes; but has adequate eye contact, generally avoids distracting mannerisms</td>
<td>Speaker relies heavily on notes; nonverbal behaviors and eye contact not natural; nervous gestures and nonverbal behaviors distract from or contradict the message</td>
<td>Usually looks down and avoids eye contact; nervous gestures and nonverbal behaviors distract from or contradict the message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience</td>
<td>Speaker shows how information is personally important to audience; speech is skillfully tailored to audience needs; values, and attitudes; speaker makes allusions to culturally shared experiences</td>
<td>Speaker implies the importance of the topic to the audience; presentation is adapted to audience needs, values, and attitudes; an attempt is made to establish common ground</td>
<td>Speaker assumes but does not articulate the importance of topic; presentation was minimally adapted to audience needs, values, and attitudes; speaker needs to more clearly establish a connection with the audience</td>
<td>The importance of topic is not established; very little evidence of audience adaptation; speaker needs to more clearly establish a connection with the audience</td>
<td>Speech is contrary to audience beliefs, values, and attitudes; message is generic or canned; no attempt is made to establish common ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Performance Standards (To be added to grading rubric as needed)</td>
<td>Exceptional explanation and presentation of visual aids; visual aids enhance understanding; visual aids of high professional quality</td>
<td>Visual aids were well displayed and explained; minor errors present in visuals</td>
<td>Visual aids were generally well presented; use of visual aids enhances understanding; visual aids good quality</td>
<td>Visual aids were poorly used or not used at all; use of visual aids irrelevant; visual aids poor professional quality</td>
<td>Use of the visual aids was poor or distracting from the speech; visual aids not relevant; visual aids poor professional quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schreiber et al. (2012) found that when applied to informative speeches, the rubric “demonstrated sufficient reliability and predictive validity,” but when it was used in evaluating persuasive speeches, the inter-rater reliability was lower, weakening the predictive validity (Schreiber et al., 2012, p. 220). This finding was particularly interesting to the current research because of the similarity in content between the PSCR and the rubric designed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007)—a descriptive rubric “designed primarily for institutional use” (shown below). The similarity between the
two rubrics extended to concerns with regard to the subjectivity of some of the descriptors used in both rating scales. In the limitations of the study, the researchers commented that the low inter-rater reliability of persuasive speeches could have been due to “message agreement / disagreement, preferences for a different organizational style, or coder fatigue… It may also be that the descriptors on this item need to be refined” (Schreiber et al., 2012, p. 224). The possibility of subjectivity in the rubrics used to evaluate public speaking alongside the low inter-rater reliability found in the evaluation of persuasive speeches has motivated the current research to look for evidence in the language to illustrate what is found in effective and ineffective persuasive speeches from a systemic functional perspective.

Rubrics and Systemic Functional Linguistics

Fang and Wang (2011) explored the use of a functional language analysis to evaluate student writing providing strategies for evaluating the writing components of content, organization, and style/tone/voice. In evaluating content, the researchers suggested analyzing transitivity patterns with attention to participants, processes, circumstances, and so on to answer the questions of “what is going on in this text?” and “what does the author tell us?” (p. 152). In evaluating organization, some questions to consider are “how does the author organize this text? Is this text well organized? By what logic is the text produced?” (p. 152). To help answer those questions, the researchers suggested analyzing theme/rheme patterns, cohesion patterns, and clause types and clause combining strategies. In evaluating style/tone/voice, the researchers suggested analyzing mood, modality, and word choices and other appraisal resources to help respond to the questions: “how does the author of this text interact with the reader? What is the author’s perspective? What is the tone of the text?” (p. 152). Fang and Wang discussed in greater detail the aspects for analysis for each of the three
writing components. The researchers commented, in reference to the written texts, that “academic, particularly scientific, texts typically thematize noun groups that are lexicalized, abstract, and dense; whereas everyday texts typically thematize items that are pronominalized” (p. 161). Further, they found that the more appropriate, academic text contained an organization that “facilitated the presentation of information and develop[ed] discursive flow” while the less appropriate, informal text lacked logical sequencing (Fang & Wang, 2011, p. 161). Raising awareness of the linguistic differences in texts coming across as strong/weak or organized/unorganized should allow the teachers using rubric-based assessment to identify the linguistic issues that cause a text to be judged intuitively as “effectively organized in a logical and creative manner” or as lacking a “high degree of craftsmanship,” which can then be used to inform lesson planning and feedback to quantify the otherwise subjective criteria of a rubric (p. 161). These comments on written texts also helps further inform the idea that impromptu speaking occurs somewhere between spoken and written modes as impromptu speeches may contain features of both written and spoken modes, providing insight into potential linguistic features to analyze.

Systemic Functional Linguistics and Developmental Path

Mohan and Slater (2005) applied the Knowledge Framework to an elementary school class in which the students were learning about magnetism through hands-on experiments; however, the article used a slightly different, more Hallidayan way of labeling the functions of the language. Mohan and Slater (2005) provided descriptions of what specifically they identified—processes of being, processes of doing, and processes of sensing including verbal (saying) processes (Halliday & Martin, 1993)—and showed how the teacher helped the students move from more commonsense, less effective causal explanations in science to
more technical, appropriate, and effective ones. The conclusions drawn from Mohan and Slater’s (2005) analysis described how the knowledge structures and theory-practice dynamic were “fundamental to the development of literacy in school science both for individual students and for the group as a whole” (p. 170), and most motivating and relevant to the current thesis research, Mohan and Slater stated that the structures they encountered occur across disciplines such as science and history. These subjects tend to involve report genres, explanation genres, and recount genres all of which have expectations with regard to the types of language and knowledge structures used, and Mohan and Slater commented that their Knowledge Framework can be applied beyond history and science. Some of the aforementioned genres—history, explanation, recount—were presented in Martin and Rose’s (2008) book, *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture*, under the same heading of histories. Admittedly Martin and Rose (2008) provided different stages and different linguistic features for each of these genres; however, the explanation genre seemed to fit under the group of argument genres raising the relevance of Mohan and Slater’s (2005) findings to the present study.

Mohan and Slater (2006) working also with the development of causal explanations, investigated theory/practice relations in a high school science class using the KF, and the instructor’s links between KSs to answer the question of how the instructor and students used language as a resource for meaning to build science knowledge in theory and practice through experiments and discussion. The article contained examples of the classroom discourse and assigned a different font formatting to indicate the language that signals a knowledge structure. This was very helpful for being able to analyze the discourse along with the article as it was presented. The analysis also addressed the language the instructor used to
recast information from the same functional approach. This aspect helped answer the important question of how to analyze and include examples that help visualize the knowledge structures and lexical cohesion resources present in the discourse to then discussing what the excerpt exemplified in detail helping support the researchers’ point. At the micro-level of their analysis, the researchers were able to determine how lexical items were used as cohesive resources to link between theory and practice in the science lesson. Mohan and Slater’s method of indicating KSs and resources for lexical cohesion facilitated a better understanding of the language that constituted a knowledge structure or cohesive device. The conclusions drawn from the research were interesting as well, consisting of a breakdown of how theory and practice were related in science classroom discourse and pedagogical implications of being intentional and systematic with language in order to facilitate development of the language and content.

Levis, Levis, and Slater (2012) analyzed graduate teaching assistants’ (GTAs’) language using SFL to investigate how international teaching assistants (ITAs) and native teaching assistants (NTAs) construct oral lectures from a written prompt. There were 14 participants in the study, and they were provided with a short reading from which they were to take 20 minutes to develop a four- to six-minute presentation. This work relates strongly to the current study, in which the speeches would be prepared for a set amount of time based on a short prompt, and although there was the difference in preparation time, the goal to analyze strategies present in creating an oral presentation is similar. The analysis found that the American TAs’ lectures contained the same basic pattern of knowledge structures that were present in the prompt. Some of the knowledge structures included classification/description and then combinations of those structures with principles/sequence. The Chinese and Indian
TAs had some variation in the knowledge structures used; for example, the Chinese TAs used some evaluation/choice knowledge structures and some of the Indian TAs did not establish or define the topic at the start of the lecture, which is something that the other two groups did do. These characteristics of the academic discourse between GTAs with varying L1s were informative in that it further described how the L1 might affect the use of knowledge structures. Levis, Levis, and Slater went further with their analysis and analyzed the textual meaning of the discourse through the participants’ use of “prosody to build coherence and cohesion in their spoken texts” (Levis, Levis, & Slater, 2012, p. 539). They found that the three groups of teaching assistants (TAs) each used pitch, stress, and rate differently with varying impacts on the information conveyed in their lectures. The relevance of these findings was in the TAs marking of new/given information, and focus and contrast. Analyzing for these aspects of pronunciation is outside the scope on the current study; however, that such textual items as new and given information as well as sentence focus and contrast have been found to affect the perception of oral presentations is important. Findings and implications of the three previous articles helped draw attention to the importance of linguistic awareness as an educator. With the need for instructors to evaluate students, provide meaningful feedback, and exemplify their expectations for their students, it is the hope of the researcher that findings from this thesis can be used to raise awareness to deliberately choosing the language used in instruction in the basic course in communication so students may also benefit.

Expectations of the genre

Clark, in her book The Genre of Argument (1998), discussed how argument is a genre that must be learned and one that will be helpful to “students throughout their university
careers” because they will be participating in academic discourse, which “is really a form of argumentation” (p. x). Clark further discussed the classical form of argumentation, and described it as consisting of an introduction, body, and conclusion with each part coming with its own set of expectations. The content of the introduction usually consists of an indication of the topic, establishment of why it is controversial, and presentation of the claim. The body consists of the nature of the controversy, support for the thesis, and anticipation and refutation of opposing viewpoints. The conclusion consists of a summary of the main argument, suggestion of the action that should be taken, and a sense of closure. Clark’s work is very helpful in supporting the current research because the expectations described are very similar to the expectations for the persuasive impromptu speeches as well as those described in resources on genre from an SFL perspective. Furthermore, Clark’s description of how signposting is done for moving between ideas match what is looked for in the Knowledge Framework as was seen in Mohan (2001). Some signpost functions she provided include “to establish cause and effect; to show similarity; to show difference; to elaborate; and to explain or present examples” (p. 246). Though the descriptions of the signposts are somewhat different, they complement the cohesive resources discussed previously.

Coffin (2004) analyzed argument structure in IELTS written responses and aimed to find the preferred organization and arguing genre, whether there was a relationship between the argument structure and final score, and whether there was a relationship between argument structure and writing prompt. In setting up the study, Coffin presented the four common arguing genres—hortatory and analytical exposition and hortatory and analytical discussion—as well as the expected stages in each genre. A breakdown of the four arguing genres can be seen below.
**Figure 2.2. Four Common Arguing Genres in Student Academic Writing (Coffin, 2004).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Hortatory Exposition</th>
<th>Analytical Exposition</th>
<th>Hortatory Discussion</th>
<th>Analytical Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>To put forward a point of view and recommend a course of action</td>
<td>To put forward a point of view or argument</td>
<td>To argue the case for two or more points of view about an issue and recommend a course of action</td>
<td>To argue the case for two or more points of view about an issue and state a position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staging</strong></td>
<td>Thesis (Recommendation) Arguments+Evidence (Counter-Arguments + Evidence) (Reinforcement of thesis) Recommendation</td>
<td>Thesis Arguments + Evidence (Counter-Arguments+ Evidence) (Reinforcement of thesis)</td>
<td>Issue Arguments + Evidence (2 or more perspectives) (Judgement/Position) Recommendation</td>
<td>Issue Arguments + Evidence (2 or more perspectives) Judgement/Position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the difference in stages seen between the genres, Coffin noted that the hortatory and analytical structures also differ linguistically in that analytical texts tend to be interpersonally distant, whereas hortatory texts tend to be more interpersonally charged between the writer and the reader (Coffin, 2004). The researcher hypothesized that the discussion genres would be more common in the argumentative essays, and that the candidates would prefer the analytical structure over the hortatory to seem objective and distant; however, after the analysis it seemed that the IELTS candidates used more exposition genres, and they tended to use more hortatory structures. As the article moved toward the discussion section, the connection between argument structure and the rubric used in IELTS was made clearer. Coffin commented that the high-scoring and low-scoring candidates could be predicted by presence or lack of a clear and cohesive structure despite the fact that the examiners may not consciously award points for argument structure, and certain deficiencies such as a missing thesis or other stages in the argumentative structure were mostly found in low-scoring candidates (Coffin, 2004).
Coffin’s (2004) findings and comments regarding the differences between hortatory and analytical expositions corroborated those of Martin (1989); however, Coffin’s research concerned only the written mode of the arguing genres—Martin (1989) provided information on hortatory and analytical expositions in both spoken and written English. Martin commented that hortatory expositions, texts that persuade others to do something, contain more feelings and emotions, which more closely reflects spoken language. In analytical expositions, texts that persuade others that a judgment is correct, feelings and attitudes rarely occur, and if feelings and attitudes are expressed, they may be more impersonal and occur as grammatical metaphor (Martin, 1989). Furthermore, analytical expositions similar to scientific writing may use passive voice to remove human agency all together to ensure the presence of only the facts. Regarding the use of reasoning, Martin commented that the removal of conjunctions affects the strength of an argument; the hypothetical if, for example, may occur more often in a spoken style. The conjunction if, through posing a hypothetical situation, realizes the causal relationship between items and serves as a method to make reasoning more explicit (Martin, 1989). Martin’s statements regarding the strength of an argument and being marked by a conjunction helped guide the current study by justifying the analysis of causal conjunctions in student persuasive impromptu speeches. Might more effective speeches use fewer causal conjunctions, and better reflect written texts? Or might the effective speeches make better use of causal conjunctions, thus making the line of reasoning more explicit and reflecting a more conversational style?

The literature reviewed here shows how systemic functional linguistics, and its various applications to discourse analysis and assessment of discourse, has been carried out to respond to situations similar to that described in this thesis, particularly in the evaluation
of academic text. Most of the applications of SFL discourse analysis and genre analysis were situated in classroom discourse or learner interlanguage with a focus on assessment in OPIs and interaction; with Levis et al. (2012) the KF was applied to short lectures constructed based on a prompt. Perhaps most important was the use of SFL analysis to supplement the evaluation of student writing using a rubric which would lead to better defining and identifying the language constituting the potential vagueness and subjectivity of descriptors in rubrics. This pattern of research has furthered the field of linguistics by providing an approach to register and genre analysis with aims for promoting language teaching. The methods and findings of these articles have helped inform the approach proposed for the current research along with helping motivate the investigation of knowledge structures in persuasive impromptu speeches. Clark’s (1998) book further defined the genre of argumentation from an outside perspective, and the similarities between argumentation as she described it and how SFL characterizes arguing genres serve as additional motivation as SFL may provide a useful way of viewing language to potentially clarify and reinforce the expectations and characteristics of the genre in a mode that is somewhere between conversational and written English.

What the examination of the literature has revealed is a need for an examination of authentic impromptu speeches to explore the relationship between the linguistic features and successful delivery. Thus this exploratory study aims to approach the analysis of these speeches from a systemic functional linguistic perspective using a cohesion analysis to identify and discuss the cohesive resources—particularly reference (pronouns and demonstratives), lexical cohesion resources (repetition and synonymy), and conjunctions (additive, temporal, causal, continuative, multi-resource conjunctions)—that occur in
effective and ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches, and to provide pedagogical
implications for teaching native and nonnative speakers of English about successful use of
cohesion and language in the genre.

The research questions which guide this study are therefore:

RQ#1: What are the linguistic features of cohesion that appear in effective and
ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches?

RQ#2: How do theme/rheme progressions develop in effective and ineffective
persuasive impromptu speeches?

RQ#3: How is the language reflected in the rubric used for planning and evaluation?
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In a given semester, the students in the basic course in communication at Iowa State University encounter at least three impromptu speeches fulfilling one of two general purposes—to instruct and to persuade. The persuasive impromptu speeches were selected for analysis for several reasons: they allow for potentially more variation in approach to completing the task, they occur later in the semester alleviating potential difficulties with adhering to the general structure of the speech, and with the limited preparation time, the language and content may closer represent the students’ speaking abilities. The persuasive impromptu speeches have the potential to vary more than the instructional impromptus in both organizational pattern and in content. This is of interest because when an impromptu speech is effective impressionistically, there may be different linguistic features that contribute to this, as well as the patterns of the language which may be more appealing to the listener. Additionally, the basic course encourages students to make use of a specific style of organization for developing the introduction and conclusion of the speech, which seems to be difficult to internalize for some students early on. As the semester progresses and the students become more experienced, the negative effects of learning and using an unfamiliar method of organization seem to decrease in time for the persuasive unit. These two considerations were initial concerns in selecting the type of speech to analyze, and it seemed that selecting the persuasive impromptu speech was an adequate response.

Data

In selecting the data it was important to ensure that the judgment of representatively effective and ineffective speeches could not be attributed solely to the researcher’s
subjectivity. A credentialed instructor for the basic course in communication, with over eight years of experience teaching the course, was consulted and the instructor supplied de-identified audio files of three effective and three ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches from two different sections that she taught. The data come from the basic course in communication at Iowa State University, which is listed as Speech Communication 212, the fundamentals of public speaking. The impromptu speeches used were persuasive, and the speakers consisted of three males in the ineffective group and three females in the effective group. Information regarding the prompt was not collected; however, the topics can be deduced from listening and reading the transcriptions. These files were transcribed by the researcher and were assigned identification codes of G1-G3 for the effective speeches and B1-B3 for the ineffective speeches (see complete transcriptions in APPENDIX A). The speeches were between one and two minutes long, adhering to the guidelines of the rubric, which made the task of transcribing them not particularly arduous. The audio recordings were clear as well; thus the transcriptions did not require a second person verification. After the data were transcribed, each transcription was divided into the three main sections of the speech: introduction, body, and conclusion. The stages of the introduction and conclusion were then identified—attention getter, thesis, and preview in the introduction; restatement of thesis, review, and final statement in the conclusion. The transcriptions of the speeches captured all of the speakers’ language including fillers, such as um and er, and all instances of self-correction. Self-correction was described by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) as the speaker’s “replacement of an error or mistake by what is correct” (p. 363). Additionally, punctuation was imposed on the discourse—question marks (?) for questions, commas (,) for short pauses and separating items in a list, and periods (.) for marking longer pauses.
Procedure

The research was an exploratory qualitative discourse analysis, which was defined by Lazaraton (2009) as an investigation of the language used in spoken and written communication. Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) further described a piece of discourse as “an instance of spoken or written language that has describable internal relationships of form and meaning (for example, words, structure, and cohesion—the ways in which pronouns and conjunctions connect parts of text) that relate coherently to an external communicative function or purpose and a given audience/interlocutor” (p. 4). That definition captures the essence of what was investigated in this analysis. The transcribed data were analyzed by hand to account for the resources of the textual metafunction initially at the clause level, then at the text level. Items of the clause level included theme/rheme, sentence focus, and verb group voice. Halliday and Mattiessen (2004) defined theme as “the point of departure of the message; it is that which locates and orients the clause within its context,” thus in English, the theme comes first in the clause (p. 64). The remainder of the message, following the theme, is the rheme (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Sentence focus was defined by Biber et al. (2002) as a point in a sentence that “receives some prominence in the clause” (p. 399). In spoken English focus can be determined by stress or intonation, and the focus can occur at the end of the clause with the presentation of new information or it can occur at the beginning, which can result in more than one focus in the clause (Biber et al., 2002). Verb groups are “expansions of a verb…consist[ing] of a sequence of words on the primary class of verb,” and the voicing of the verb group can be active or passive (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 335). Items of the text level consisted of cohesive devices, topic sentences, and thematic development.
The next step in the analysis was to analyze each speech for the different aspects of cohesion based on Collerson (1994), including references through pronouns, demonstratives, and comparatives; ellipses/substitutions; lexical cohesion strategies through repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, and grammatical metaphor; and conjunctions such as additive, temporal, causal, adversative, and continuative conjunctions. To facilitate this analysis, the data were processed by the freeware corpus analysis and concordancing tool Antconc found at http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/ (Anthony, 2011). The wordlists created by the program were used as a reference for tallying the reference resources and conjunction resources. The items under lexical cohesion were determined by an initial analysis by hand by the researcher; however, to establish intercoder reliability (see Creswell & Miller, 2000) another coder—a PhD student in applied linguistics and technology at Iowa State University familiar with systemic functional linguistics—was brought in to ensure accuracy in counting the instances of each cohesive resource. He was given two copies of the de-identified, transcribed speeches—one copy had the speeches marked for the stages in the speech and the other copy was an unmarked text document to facilitated processing with Antconc. He was also provided with a list of the cohesive devices, their definitions, and examples of each to ensure consistency. A meeting time was scheduled to go through one speech together to check the initial counts and to match instances of cohesive devices with their type. After the meeting, the other speeches were checked individually to ensure counts were accurate. Only two items needed an additional count because the number did not match—pronouns and temporal conjunctions. This was resolved after a second count, and the data analysis proceeded.
Determining instances of reference resources, ellipses/substitutions, and conjunctions was done largely by hand and by cross-checking the counts with the output data from Antconc. Determining frequencies in the lexical cohesion resources required close reading of the transcriptions and consistency of judgment. For example, when counting synonymy there might be three words used interchangeably for the same meaning; this would count as three in the synonymy category. If there was another instance of synonymy in the same speech where a pair of words would be used as synonyms, that would count as two, and it would be added to the three that was previously accounted for totaling five instances of synonymy.

Counting instances of hyponymy and meronymy followed a different guideline. With hyponymy, there would have to be a general-specific relationship between words. For example, if the words animals and pets occurred in a text, pets would be a more specific group within the larger, more general group animals, counting as one instance of hyponymy. The same rule applied for meronymy—two words sharing a part-whole relationship would count as one instance of meronymy. Accounting for repetition required the most judgment; however, the process for determining repetition started with analyzing the transcription for recurring lexical words, then processing the data with Antconc to count frequencies and to check other repeated words. The raw counts of the cohesive devices were put into an Excel spreadsheet, and a second table was created containing the normed counts. To normalize the data, a function was applied to the counts to multiply the raw count by 100 (the number to which the data are to be normed), then divide the product by the total number of words in the speech. Normalizing the data to occurrences per 100 words allows for comparisons to be made between texts of different sizes (Biber et al., 2002). In the current research, the total number of words varies between speeches, and normalizing to 100 words allows for
determining relative frequency of items which is used in comparing speeches and groups of speeches.

The theme/rheme analysis was carried out by hand analyzing the items that occurred before the verb group as the theme and the verb group and remaining elements in the clause as the rheme. Lines were drawn from themes and rhemes throughout the text to facilitate visualization of the thematic progression similar to the method used by Bloor and Bloor (2004) and Fang and Wang (2011) where arrows were used in addition to bolding and font color changes to show the progressions of theme and rheme.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The results of this discourse analysis are presented in response to the three research questions; however, prior to answering the research questions, general characteristics of the speeches will be discussed. First to be discussed will be a type/token analysis. Below is a table showing the six speeches with the total number of words used, the total of unique words used, and the number of unique words used per 100 words; in other words, the totals for types was normed to 100 words.

Table 4.1. Types and Tokens for Each Group of Speeches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective Speeches</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>Types per 100 Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for group</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Speeches</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Types per 100 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for group</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above illustrates the differences in the total words used by each speaker (tokens) as well as the number of unique words (types). Looking first toward the tokens, one can see that overall, the group of ineffective speeches involved more words than did the effective speeches. While the difference in total words may not be substantial, the ineffective speech group’s involvement of more words may remove the possible variable of length/number of words used in affecting effectiveness.
The next item to look at is the types per 100 words—the raw number of types provides the number of unique words overall, but for comparison purposes, using the normed totals is more helpful. Based on the normed totals, the effective speeches had slightly more unique words per 100 words; however, as shown by the row of speech B2 one can see that having more unique words per 100 words does not necessarily transfer to effectiveness.

Next, the presence of speech disfluencies is a feature of conversational spoken English that has been associated with ineffectiveness. Speech disfluencies were defined by Fox Tree (1995) as “phenomena that interrupt the flow of speech and do not add propositional content to an utterance” (p. 709). Among the types of disfluencies fillers, false starts, and repeated words are some of the features that were recorded in the transcriptions. Fillers are an aspect that affects the audience’s, and likely the rater’s, perception of the speech. Below is a table illustrating the use of fillers such as *um, uh, er* and so on.

**Table 4.2. The Use of Fillers in the Six Speeches.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Fillers (raw count)</th>
<th>Fillers (per 100 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for B1-3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for G1-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the counts for the use of fillers across the six speeches, one can notice that the ineffective group involved nearly five times the number of fillers of the effective group (based on the normed counts). The use of fillers likely affected the rater’s evaluation of the speeches as the *word choice and vocals* criterion in the rubric considers the frequency of the use of fillers in the levels of achievement. It is interesting to note that speech G3 contained a normed count similar to that of speech B1; however, in evaluating speeches, the rater is
likely considering the raw count of fillers instead of a relative frequency. The overall
difference in the use of fillers may be one aspect that affects effectiveness, but the occurrence
of fillers in speech G3 may indicate that the use of fillers may be acceptable pending
excessive use or in an otherwise sound argument.

In addition to the use of fillers, it is possible that effectiveness may be correlated with
false starts and repetition (not associated with cohesion). These features occurred in the data
in both ineffective and effective groups; however, non-cohesive repetition and false starts
occurred more frequently in the ineffective speeches. While speech disfluencies occurred,
they serve as evidence for impromptu speeches being placed closer to natural speech along
the mode continuum, with the more effective speeches containing fewer of those features
than the ineffective speeches.

Speech disfluencies aside, there must be evidence that further mark effective and
ineffective speeches. Lexical density was also considered. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004)
described the typical differences between speech and writing in terms of complexity, with
written texts tending to be more “lexically dense” and spoken language tending to be more
“grammatically intricate” (p. 654). They defined being lexically dense as “pack[ing] a large
number of lexical items into each clause,” and being grammatically intricate as “build[ing]
up elaborate clause complexes out of parataxis and hypotaxis” (Halliday & Matthiessen,
2004, p. 654). The difference between parataxis and hypotaxis is in the degree of
interdependency of two clauses. Parataxis is where two clauses have “equal status [with] one
clause initiating and the other continuing,” and hypotaxis is where two clauses have unequal
status with one element being dependent on the other (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 374).
To calculate lexical density, the total of lexical words was divided by the total number of
words in the speech, providing a percentage of lexical words in the speech. The web-based application *Analyze My Writing* (www.analyzemywriting.com) was used to facilitate the calculation of lexical density. The table below shows the lexical density measures for the six speeches.

**Table 4.3. Measures of Lexical Density.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Lexical Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>41.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>40.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>43.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average: B Speeches</td>
<td>42.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>47.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>48.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average: G Speeches</td>
<td>46.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the measures of density shown above, the effective speeches contain a higher percentage of lexical words than the ineffective speeches. The difference in lexical density between speeches B3 and G1, however, is not particularly large, indicating that although lexical density may correlate somewhat with perceived effectiveness, it may not be the deciding factor. To determine whether lexical density truly correlates with effectiveness, further research would need to be done using a larger data set. Thus, if it is not the word count, speech length, or number of unique words that necessarily determines effectiveness, then we must look further into how the language is used and what linguistics features are present in the effective and ineffective speeches.

*RQ#1: What are the linguistic features of cohesion that appear in effective and ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches?*

To answer this question, this section will look at how the two groups used cohesive resources to organize the stages and information in the speeches and to create a texture appropriate to the goals of the speech. Below is a table of the normed counts (to 100 words)
for the cohesive resources that were analyzed. In the table, the left-most column contains the cohesive devices, with the category in bold and in gray. The rows with the category also contain the totals for the category in each speech as well as the total for the group.

Table 4.4. Cohesive Devices Normed to 100 Words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesive Device</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference—Total</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pronouns</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstratives</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comparison</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipses/Substitution—Total</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Cohesion—Total</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Repetition</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Synonymy</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Antonymy</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hyponymy</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meronymy</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grammatical Metaphor</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction—Total (not including multi-resource conjunctions)</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additive</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Temporal</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Causal</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adversatives</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuatives</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multi-resource</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To draw attention to some of the differences in the data to help guide the following presentation of the findings, the effective group made more use of reference overall, with differences more noticeable in pronouns and demonstratives. Both groups used lexical cohesion similarly overall; however, there were differences in the use of synonymy.

Repetition will also be discussed as speech B1 made the most use of that cohesive device, affecting the overall count for that group. Both groups also had similar totals for the use of
conjunctions overall, but there remain differences in the types of conjunctions. Interestingly, the effective speeches used more additive conjunctions, while the ineffective speeches used more causal conjunctions. Though the differences are less pronounced in the continuatives, temporal, and multi-resource conjunctions, they too are included in the discussion of the findings. Each group of linguistic features will now be discussed in detail.

**Reference**

Looking first at the use of reference overall, the group of effective speeches used a total of 17.16 references per 100 words whereas the group of ineffective speeches used 10.00 per 100 words. Within reference, both groups used pronouns much more than demonstratives and comparatives. The effective group used 14.05 pronouns and 2.77 demonstratives per 100 words, while the ineffective group used 8.74 pronouns and 1.26 demonstratives per 100 words. As Biber et al. (2002) stated, conversation contains frequent use of pronouns, particularly first-person *I* and *we* and second-person *you*. This aspect seems to be among the features of spoken language that are reflected in these impromptu speeches. As it is unlikely that merely using pronouns determines effectiveness, let us look at how pronouns are used in the two groups of speeches. While Table 4.4 showed a difference in the use of demonstratives and comparatives between the two groups, one can see that with the exception of one speech per type of reference, the counts remain very close. Because it does not seem that neither the use of demonstratives or comparatives is markedly different, pronouns will be the focus of this section.
Ineffective speeches’ use of pronouns in discourse markers, informality, and with unclear referent

Below is an excerpt from speech B1 containing the introduction and first half of the body of the speech. The stages of the introduction are marked with AG: for the attention getter, T: for the thesis, P: for the preview, and B: for the body. Pronoun usage is marked by italics.

Speech B1
AG: Alright, how many of you guys own a pet, your very own pet? all right, how many of you guys would like to give that pet up for medical testing?
T: You know, well unfortunately medical testing on animals is a necessity in life that has to be done.
P: Um the first thing is first of all we have to test medicine with um animals uh And then the second thing is it expands our knowledge of the anatomy of the animals and also the humans because humans and animals have a lot of similar body parts. Um and we wouldn’t be where we are today with the technology and medicine we have today without having to do a little bit of animal um medical testing.
B: Um, the first thing, medical testing uh er, you have to uh medicine testing. So we want to test on animals before we want to test on humans because humans have a lot I mean it’s not the same because most people love their animals and it’s not necessarily animals that we’re doing to people’s pets but still people have a problem with it. But it gets us what we need to know about the medicine that we’re making.

In the first two stages of the introduction the speaker used the pronoun you guys as well as you. In the attention getter the use of you guys seems to be an attempt to connect with the audience by acknowledging their presence as well as an attempt to make the speech interactive. The use of you guys also seems to create a feeling of informality in the attention getter that does not seem to be revisited in the same way later in the speech, but rather the speaker makes a switch to more inclusive language through the use of we, our, and us in the preview and body, with exceptions being discourse markers such as I mean and you know, which are unnecessary inclusions. Before making the switch to the more inclusive language,
the thesis begins with the discourse marker you know and makes a shift in tone to a more objective one through the use of grammatical metaphor necessity, although the objectivity and sophistication seems to be lessened by redundancy. The ineffective group also showed instances of pronoun usage that could result in a confused message because of an unclear referent as shown in italics in the excerpt from speech B3 below.

**Speech B3**

AG: Alright, so just imagine you’re sitting there watching t.v. all of the sudden your phone vibrates and up on your phone screen pops up Amber Alert.

T: Today I’m going to explain to you why I don’t think kids under fifteen shouldn’t have Facebook pages.

P: Um a lot of uh people under fifteen don’t understand a lot of social limits so while they’re out there scouring the internet they could be doing or they could be putting the wrong stuff out there uh like they could be talking to the wrong people, they could be giving out their location when they shouldn’t be and then also they could have negative effects on later in life uh.

In the attention getter, the speaker uses second-person pronouns to provide the audience with a scenario, and as the speaker shifts to the thesis, there is a shift to the first person as addressing the second-person audience despite the disjointed leap between stages. As the speech moves into the preview of the main points, the speaker begins using third-person pronouns as the topic of kids or people under fifteen are discussed. Looking toward the last line of the preview, however, the speaker maintains the use of the third-person plural pronoun when it does not seem logical that people under fifteen is the group that could have negative effects, but rather the actions that people under fifteen are participating in. While this lapse may not entirely affect the perception of the speech, it demonstrates variation in the use of the reference resource that could result in confusion for the audience.
Effective speeches’ use of pronouns with clear referent facilitating cohesion

Shifting to speech G1 of the more effective speeches, the excerpt below has similar markers as speech B1 with the addition of RS: for restatement of the thesis, RV: for review of main points, and FS: for final statement to capture the pronoun usage as it shifts throughout the speech. Pronouns have been identified in italics.

Speech G1
AG: Of all the Will Ferrell characters the best ones are absolutely Ron Burgundy and Frank the Tank
T: But I’m going to tell you today why Frank the Tank was the best out of the two for three reasons: his likeability, his humor throughout the movie, and his underdog character.
B: Number one is likeability
We love him
He is just somebody we just want to be his best friend
You see him start out as the underdog and
You see him come out as the person that you want to be on top
His humor, who can forget the streaking scene
I mean that just burns a memory, right?
So uh also his underdog
He starts off as that mild-mannered newlywed who is he is very submissive and
does what his wife says
But he finds himself throughout the movie
and you see him take [unintelligible]
RS: So today I’ve told you why Frank the Tank is the best Will Ferrell character
RV: We’ve gone over likeability, his humor, and being the underdog
FS: So I urge you all to go out and rent Old School and Weatherman and or Anchorman
and go see for yourself why it’s the best

The speaker in speech G1 makes use of first, second, and third-person pronouns. The attention getter and thesis served to establish the topic and the person about whom the speech would be. Then as the speech progresses, Frank the Tank becomes the pronoun he until the restatement of the thesis where the speaker reestablishes the topic of the speech by the character’s name. Regarding the first and second-person pronouns, this speech too made use of I and you to create an interpersonal dimension to the speech. One area of potential
confusion regarding pronouns and referents in speech G1, however, is in the final statement where the speaker shifts to suggesting an action to the audience, *to go out and rent*, the speaker uses the pronoun *it*, shown in italics and underlined. If the audience does not connect *it* to *the best Will Ferrell character* the use of *it* following the call to action might lead the audience to think that the referent is the movie in which the character exists which is being claimed as *the best*.

The excerpts shown above from speeches B3 and G1 demonstrate the potential difference in clarity in the use of pronouns in the two groups of speeches. Speech G1 showed the use of the pronouns *he, his,* and *him* as resources for cohesion, with a clear and consistent referent. Speech B3, on the other hand, attempted to use the pronoun *they* consistently in the preview of the main points, but there seemed to be a shift in referent that had not been signaled by the speaker, resulting in a lack of clarity.

**Lexical Cohesion**

The total of the uses of lexical cohesion in the effective and ineffective speeches are close—9.81 instances of lexical cohesion per 100 words in the effective speeches, and 9.64 instances of lexical cohesion per 100 words in the ineffective speeches. The table below is adapted from the previous table covering all cohesive devices analyzed in this study, focusing on the counts for lexical cohesion. Despite the closeness, a more detailed look at the differences in some types of lexical cohesion may be revealing.
Table 4.5. Lexical Cohesion Counts Normed to 100 Words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Cohesion</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B Average</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>G Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonymy</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyponymy</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meronymy</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Metaphor</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repetition

Looking at the totals for repetition, both groups were close overall with a total of 6.39 in the effective speeches and 6.35 in the ineffective speeches; however, the counts of repetition per speech are not as even. Across the three effective speeches the counts were 4.48 for G1, 7.91 for G2, and 6.79 per 100 words for G3—a range of 3.43, meaning that there was a difference of 3.43 instances of repetition per 100 words between the speech with the fewest instances and the speeches with the most instances. In the ineffective speeches, instances of repetition were 10.85 for B1, 2.65 for B2, and 5.83 for B3—a range of 8.2, showing that the counts are not as consistent with regard to closeness to the other ineffective speeches. Speech B2 seemed to be lacking in content—77 types, 151 tokens, and 51 unique words per 100 words, therefore the count for repetition is not unexpected. In comparing speeches B1 and B3, however, the count for instances of repetition in B1 is nearly double that of B3, leading to the question how does the use of repetition vary within and between the two groups of speeches?
Content mismatch with repeated words in ineffective speeches

The example below is of speech B1. Items that were considered as repetition are in bold, and a list of the words can be seen below.

Table 4.6. Repetition of Words in Speech B1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal(s)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test(ing)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine(s)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speech B1

AG: Alright, how many of you guys own a pet, your very own pet? alright, how many of you guys would like to give that pet up for medical testing?

T: You know, well unfortunately medical testing on animals is a necessity in life that has to be done.

P: Um the first thing is first of all we have to test medicine with um animals uh And then the second thing is it expands our knowledge of the anatomy of the animals and also the humans because humans and animals have a lot of similar body parts.

Um and we wouldn’t be where we are today with the technology and medicine we have today without having to do a little bit of animal um medical testing.

B: Um, the first thing, medical testing uh er, you have to uh medicine testing. So we want to test on animals before we want to test on humans because humans have a lot I mean it’s not the same because most people love their animals and it’s not necessarily animals that we’re doing to people’s pets but still people have a problem with it.

But it gets us what we need to know about the medicine that we’re making. Uh and then secondly it expands our knowledge of um the anatomy of the animal, the anatomy of the human body, expands our knowledge of more medicines uh the effects of medicines on certain animals compared to other animals.

Um and lastly we wouldn’t be where we are today with the medicine testing on, we have so many medicines that can cure different things and you know back in the day when somebody lost a leg or something like that they were probably gonna die because of the infection or because of lack of medication because of various viruses um bacteria things like that.
RV: And so uh that’s where we are today um and that’s because we’re there because of animal testing.

FS: Um it may not be something that is really necessarily moral um but we have to try to keep it humane you know uh that’s what I would like to do

RS: so um medical testing is a necessity in uh in life.

The speaker makes some morphological changes to the words shown in the table above (marked in parenthesis), but largely the speaker relies on those five resources to carry the message. When considering the total type and token counts for speech B1—135 types, 378 tokens, and 35.7 unique words per 100 words—the words in the table above made up nine types (including morphological changes) and 41 tokens. One can see that despite the speaker’s repetition of those main words, the content of the speech did not seem to discuss testing of any kind on animals. This shows that the use of repetition to maintain focus on a topic should be accompanied by content that supports the focus of the message.

The speaker of speech B3 on the other hand seems to make use of three key words (shown in the table below) for a total of 19 times. Speech B3 had 128 types and 326 tokens, which transfers to 38.7 unique words per 100 words. The difference in the use of repetition between speeches in the ineffective group could demonstrate the existence of further variation within the group.

**Table 4.7. Repetition of Words in Speech B3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The excerpt below was taken from the beginning of the body of speech B3, and it serves to demonstrate repetition in the speech. Looking at the words before and after the repeated word shown in bold, one can track the focus of the first part of the body of the speech.
Speech B3

B: So talking to the wrong people uh whether it be through Facebook or other social media uh there are a lot of twisted people out there uh that want to do some really bad things so um if you enable people to get ahold of them, then that, I mean, you could just take away a lot of the risk from not allowing people to have er by not allowing people under fifteen to have Facebook pages uh that would also eliminate them giving out unnecessary locations, and then uh negative effects later in life.

The speaker starts the body of the speech by stating the first topic/main point talking to the wrong people. In introducing the first point, one can see that specifically the speaker is referring to a particular group of people, the wrong people, which the speaker further describes as twisted people out there that want to do some really bad things, providing the audience with a sense of danger for young people. The speaker then shifts to using people to refer to the people under fifteen, which may demonstrate overuse of people as it no longer seems to serve a cohesive purpose.

Repetition used as a resource for cohesion in effective speeches

Looking now toward the effective speeches and how repetition is used there, speech G3 contained the second most repetition of the effective speeches. In speech G3 there are two words that are repeated noticeably more than the others: uniforms occurs eight times and school occurs seven times. These two words tended to occur together; however, there were exceptions. An excerpt containing the introduction and the first main point of the body of speech G3 is shown below. The two repeated words are marked in bold.

Speech G3

AG: How long did it take you to pick your clothes this morning?
   5 minutes, 10 minutes, 15?
   That’s a lot of time to waste in the morning.
T: And one solution uh to this is if you have your school uniforms.
P: Reasons why students should have school uniforms is to save time, money, and to be better involved in the school.
B: One of the reasons um having school uniforms is beneficial is for the time factor. Every morning you spend so much time picking out your clothes and
figuring out what to wear when you can better spend your time focusing on (indistinguishable) things like cramming for that next test.

The speaker of speech G3 first uses the repeated terms in the thesis where *school uniforms* is presented as a solution to the problem of spending too much time choosing clothes for school; however, the speaker uses *school uniforms* again in the preview of the main points to say that their solution would also help with *time, money, and [being] better involved.* Interestingly, the speaker uses *time* six times and *money* four times. It is not surprising to see that the topics of two of the main points are repeated, but it is intriguing to see that the final main point to *be better involved in the school* was rephrased rather than repeated.

**Speech G3**

**Main Point 3:** Another reason is uh school uniforms make uh make students feel more uh community-sensed in their classrooms. All their classmates are wearing the same thing and having the same uniforms. This makes them feel this makes them feel more unified with their classroom.

A possible reason for the rephrasing of the topic of the third main point might be because the topic is presented as what Martin (1989) refers to as a feeling or attitude rather than as a nominalized form, which might have facilitated parallel structuring in the preview of the main points, and repetition for the sake of cohesion. The speaker does well to rephrase the topic in a way that maintains the meaning of the topic as it was presented earlier in the speech.

The excerpts shown above illustrate the different effects of the uses of repetition in the effective and ineffective speeches. The ineffective speeches may repeat some main words to reinforce the topic; however, speech B1 showed that content should also be considered to ensure that the main points support the argument. Speech B3 showed some overuse of a more general word *people,* which was used to refer to both *kids* and *the wrong people.* Speech G3
used repetition more cohesively to organize the main points of the speech as well as to ensure the focus of the speech was clear.

_Synonymy_

Looking at the use of synonymy in the ineffective and effective speeches, the ineffective group had a total of 2.13 instances of synonymy per 100 words, and the effective group had a total of 0.77 instances of synonymy per 100 words. This section will first analyze the use of synonymy in the ineffective speeches, starting with speech B1 with the highest raw count, then speech B2 with the second highest raw count. The section will also include an analysis of speech G2 which contains the same raw count of synonymy as G3 in the effective group. Although the normed count for synonymy is slightly lower for speech G2, the examples exemplify the use of synonymy for cohesion, showing how synonymy differs where the numbers/frequencies may not.

_Synonymy and mismatch in context in ineffective speeches_

Speech B1 contained seven total instances of synonymy consisting of three unique groups of synonyms. The largest synonymous group contained three noun groups that were used interchangeably to refer to the same process: *medical testing, medicine testing,* and *animal testing*. Initially the speech presents the topic of *medical testing on animals*, but as the speech progresses, the speaker reduces that noun group to the *medical testing, medicine testing,* and *animal testing*. The speaker seems to attempt reestablishing the topic, as it was presented initially, in the third main point with *um and lastly we wouldn’t be where we are with the medicine testing on* but the speaker aborts and continues with a hypothetical, historical situation as shown below.
Speech B1

Main Point 3: Um and lastly we wouldn’t be where we are today with the medicine testing on, we have so many medicines that can cure different things and you know back in the day when somebody lost a leg or something like that they were probably gonna die because of the infection or because of lack of medication because of various viruses um bacteria things like that.

There is an additional issue with the content of this main point in that the preview contains

*Um and we wouldn’t be where we are today with the technology and medicine we have today without having to do a little bit of animal um medical testing* as the third main point of the argument; however, the content of the third main point discusses a past situation, making no mention of technological or medical advancement due to animal testing. This issue may have risen due a lack of specialist knowledge to support the main point the speaker aimed to discuss, thus possibly affecting the perception of the speaker’s reasoning. The other groups of synonyms used, *people/humans* and *medicine/medication*, seem to have been used with care respecting the subtleties in meaning to ensure appropriate usage.

Speech B2, although affected by lack of content and structural issues, contained five total, successful uses of synonymy: *accident/wreck* and *elderly person/70 year olds/people over 70*. It could be argued that the synonyms of *elderly person* might be giving further definition to the group to which the speaker is referring; however, the speaker seems to be using the noun groups interchangeably. The excerpt below shows the introduction and body of speech B2 illustrating the instances of synonymy.

Speech B2

AG: Alright, how many people here have almost been in an *accident* or been in an accident because of an *elderly person* driving on the road?

T: I am here to um tell you why *people over seventy year olds* er seventy years old should uh have driving tests uh each year should be mandatory.

P: Um for protecting others eh on the road and pedestrians, protecting themselves and if they fail, they shouldn’t be able to drive or they should be have to retest within so many months.
**B:** Um fifty percent of **seventy year olds** uh get in a wreck each year and uh sorry um…uh

Speech B2 seems to introduce the problem of an *elderly person driving* in the attention getter, then the speaker establishes in the thesis the topic and position on the argument which includes *people over seventy [years old]*. The body of the speech brings in the topic of *seventy year olds* which may carry a slightly different meaning; however, the speaker seems to be using the three noun groups synonymously.

*Synonymy used sparingly for cohesive and interpersonal effect in effective speeches*

Speech G2 contained three instances of synonymy: *people, students,* and *kid.* Looking at those three words it is very clear that they are not synonyms; however, the speaker of speech G2 uses them interchangeably to refer to students as the excerpt below illustrates.

**Speech G2**

**B:** According to Harvard law they saw a 48% decrease in their **students**’ stress levels because they allowed them to have their pets with them on campus. You can go into their library see a dog chilling next to a **student** studying for the BAR exam, But that **kid** is going to do great because they saw a 23% increase in their grades and their BAR exams because they allowed pets on campus. Not only that Marquette University also saw an astounding 52% increase in their **students’** grades when they allowed them to bring their cat and their dogs with them to the library, school. Their only exception is not in the cafeteria You know, dogs get a little crazy around food. Not only that, your anxiety levels. I know when I’m getting ready for a big test finals week I get nervous, I get anxious, and I’m just over the top just I need something to help me calm down. And that’s when I wish I had my dog with me on campus. He always knows when I’m a little upset, nervous, anxious. While he might not be the best to comfort me, He usually tries to bite my feet, He knows that that little distraction will help me calm down and do better.

**RV:** And in conclusion, pets in general will help **people** improve in their grades, lower their stress levels, and help them manage their anxiety.

**RS:** If nothing else, it’ll give them a friend on campus because like they said, dogs are a man’s best friend.
FS: And if you’re ever without a friend bring your pet to school.

The excerpt above shows how the speaker uses the words *kid* and *people* to refer to carry the same meaning as *student*. Despite the use of synonymy as a cohesive device in this case, the speaker’s use of those words to refer to *students* could serve as a source of confusion for the audience. For example, in the situation where *kid* is used, the speaker is introducing statistics from a university. This implies that the *students* being referred to are not kids in the literal meaning of the word, but rather *kid* seems to serve as a diminutive for *students*, adding an interpersonal dimension to the statement. The use of *people* in the review of the main points to refer to *students* may have been inadvertent; however, thinking in terms of general/specific relationships, or hypernymy/hyponymy, as was introduced previously, *people* as referring to *students* creates a more generalized message, which seems to be reflected in the speaker’s use of *pets* instead of *dogs* as the speaker discussed earlier in the speech. An additional marker of a more general message is the use of *in general* following *pets*, which seems to work as a pair rather than as including *people* in the general group. The context surrounding *people* also leads the audience to assume that *people* is synonymous with *student* through the use of *improve their grades* making the choice of *people* as the beneficiary of the process *help* perhaps not the most efficient option as a speaker or listener.

The differences in the uses of synonymy in ineffective and effective speeches seem to lie in frequency and effect. The ineffective speeches used more synonyms, but the speakers seemed to be less deliberate in their choices of synonyms and effect they might have. Speeches B1 and B2 seemed to treat the synonyms as an opportunity to further define the topic. The effective speeches seemed to use synonyms that affected the perception the topic
such as with *kid* and *people* both used to represent *student*—the use of *kid* as a diminutive and *people* as a more general term.

**Conjunctions**

This section will look at the frequencies and role of conjunctions in the effective and ineffective speeches by providing examples of conjunctions in context. Looking at the counts for the use of conjunctions overall, the effective speeches used only slightly more than the ineffective speeches, with 7.45 conjunctions used per 100 words in the effective speeches and 7.09 conjunctions used per 100 words in the ineffective speeches, but different kinds were used by each as will be discussed. The table below shows the normed frequencies of conjunctions in each speech and each group of speeches as well as the counts for the types of conjunctions analyzed.

**Table 4.8. Conjunction Counts Normed to 100 words.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Additive</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Temporal</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Causal</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adversatives</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuatives</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multi-resource</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (not including multi-resource conjunctions)</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above illustrates the difference in conjunction use between speeches. To facilitate the following discussions the differences to note are the use of additive conjunctions—4.69 instances in the effective speeches and 3.13 instances in the ineffective speeches; the use of multi-resource conjunctions—0.44 instances in the effective speeches and 0.87 uses in the ineffective speeches; the use of causal conjunctions—0.57 instances in the effective speeches...
and 1.57 instances in the ineffective speeches; and the use of temporal conjunctions—1.04 instances in the effective speeches and 1.32 instances in the ineffective speeches. The positioning of the multi-resource conjunctions after the additive conjunctions is due to the frequency with which an additive conjunction is used in the multi-resource conjunction in the speeches. Some of the differences marked for discussion do not seem vast based on the normed counts; however, the sections presenting those results aim to mark differences in how the conjunctions are used differently. 

**Additive conjunctions to signal main points in effective speeches**

To demonstrate the difference in the use of additive conjunctions in the two groups of speeches, this section will first look at speech G3 which used the second most additive conjunctions with regard to raw count, but it was tied with speech G1 for the highest normed count for additive conjunctions. Speech G3 contained a raw count of 13 and a normed count of 4.98 instances of additives per 100 words. The excerpt below consists of the introduction and body of the speech, and the additive conjunctions are marked in bold.

**Speech G3**

*AG:* How long did it take you to pick your clothes this morning?  
5 minutes, 10 minutes, 15?  
That’s a lot of time to waste in the morning.  

*T:* And one solution uh to this is if you have your school uniforms.  

*P:* Reasons why students should have school uniforms is to save time, money, and to be better involved in the school.  

*B:* One of the reasons um having school uniforms is beneficial is for the time factor. Every morning you spend so much time picking out your clothes and figuring out what to wear when you can better spend your time focusing on (indistinguishable) things like cramming for that next test.  

**Another reason** is money. Students today spend a lot of money on expensive designer clothing and trendy outfits when they can be cost-savvy and buy uniforms. You don’t have to have designer this and trendy that, and You can just wear the required uniforms to school.  

**Another reason** is uh school uniforms make uh make students feel more uh community-sensed in their classrooms.
All their classmates are wearing the same thing and having the same uniforms. This makes them feel more unified with their classroom.

The excerpt from speech G3 illustrates the speaker’s use of two different resources to mark the addition of content between and within stages. The speaker moves into the thesis of the speech by using the additive conjunction and. The occurrence of and in this position does not seem to function as adding information to the statements made in the attention getter, but rather as a marker for the change in stage from the attention getter to the thesis. As DeVito (2008) described, a thesis is a complete declarative sentence that focuses on the main message to be conveyed to the audience. Considering those characteristics of the thesis, one could argue that the use of a conjunction before stating the thesis is unnecessary and may lead the audience to think that the speaker is merely adding to the attention getter. The first example of additive conjunction showed a situation where the use of the conjunction may have been superfluous, showing once again that within perceived effective speeches imperfection in delivery or content is accepted and may still come across as effective. The speaker demonstrates some variation in the body of the speech where the main points seem to be signaled by another reason, an additive conjunction, following the initial use of one of the reasons, which was not considered additive. The use of another reason consistently to mark the second and third points may serve as a helpful marker for the listeners to follow the speaker’s reasoning as well as facilitating the audience’s detection of the additive relationship between main points.
Additive conjunctions used to connect clauses rather than for cohesion in ineffective speeches

Speech B2 contained additive conjunctions; however, the occurrences of the additive conjunctions seem to differ from the function that they served in speech G3. The excerpt below displays the uses of additive conjunctions in bold to illustrate the variation in usage.

**Speech B2**

*AG:* Alright, how many people here have almost been in an accident or been in an accident because of an elderly person driving on the road?

*T:* I am here to um tell you why people over seventy year olds er seventy years old should uh have driving tests uh each year should be mandatory.

*P:* Um for protecting others eh on the road and pedestrians, protecting themselves and if they fail, they shouldn’t be able to drive or they should be have to retest within so many months.

*B:* Um fifty percent of seventy year olds uh get in a wreck each year and uh sorry um…uh.

*RV:* Uh anyway the reasons were um protecting themselves and the others in case they have eye problems or any disabilities

*RS:* they should have to be tested each year um that’s protecting people on the road and yeah they should have to get tested

*FS:* thanks

Whereas speech G3 seemed to use additive conjunctions as cohesive devices, the additive conjunctions in speech B2 seem to be used less deliberately, coming across as more informal conversation than as a shortly prepared speech.

The examples above show the difference in function in the use of additive conjunctions in the effective and ineffective speeches. Speech G3 used additive conjunctions to signal the main points of the speech through the use of another reason. Speech B2, on the other hand seemed to use additive conjunctions as a resource for coordinating clauses, but without a cohesive effect.
Multi-resource conjunctions as redundancy in ineffective speeches

The category of multi-resource conjunctions arose from the initial cohesion analysis where some of the speeches tended to combine conjunctions of the same type as well as combining different types of conjunctions to seemingly serve one function. Several of the instances of these multi-resource conjunctions consisted of two conjunctions; however, there were a number of instances of more than two conjunctions being combined to connect parts of the speech resulting in the label multi-resource. In the two groups of speeches, the ineffective speeches had a normed count of 0.87 per 100 words, and the effective speeches had a normed count of 0.44. Speech B1 seemed to contain the most instances of this type of conjunction with a raw count of 6, and a normed count of 1.59. Speech B1 is shown below with the multi-word conjunctions marked in bold.

Speech B1

AG: Alright, how many of you guys own a pet, your very own pet? alright, how many of you guys would like to give that pet up for medical testing?

T: You know, well unfortunately medical testing on animals is a necessity in life that has to be done.

P: Um the first thing is first of all we have to test medicine with um animals uh And then the second thing is it expands our knowledge of the anatomy of the animals and also the humans because humans and animals have a lot of similar body parts.

Um and we wouldn’t be where we are today with the technology and medicine we have today without having to do a little bit of animal um medical testing.

B: Um, the first thing, medical testing uh er, you have to uh medicine testing. So we want to test on animals before we want to test on humans because humans have a lot I mean it’s not the same because most people love their animals and it’s not necessarily animals that we’re doing to people’s pets but still people have a problem with it.

But it gets us what we need to know about the medicine that we’re making. Uh and then secondly it expands our knowledge of um the anatomy of the animal, the anatomy of the human body, expands our knowledge of more medicines uh the effects of medicines on certain animals compared to other animals.

Um and lastly we wouldn’t be where we are today with the medicine testing on, we have so many medicines that can cure different things and you know back in
the day when somebody lost a leg or something like that they were probably gonna die because of the infection or because of lack of medication because of various viruses um bacteria things like that.

RV: And so uh that’s where we are today um and that’s because we’re there because of animal testing.

FS: Um it may not be something that is really necessarily moral um but we have to try to keep it humane you know uh that’s what I would like to do

RS: so um medical testing is a necessity in uh in life.

The speaker in speech B1 seems to use the additive conjunction and with temporal conjunctions mostly, but other combinations include additive-additive, additive-continuative, and temporal-temporal. Two of the additive-temporal combinations occur at the beginning of a new main point as well as one combination signaling the second main point in the preview. The conjunctions seem to be sequencing items in an argument rather than sequencing main points chronologically with the use of the additive and seeming to function as adding a second and a final point to the argument. The use of then, on the other hand, in the conjunction group and then secondly does not seem to serve the same purpose and and secondly do. The use of secondly matches the ordering style introduced by the speaker in the first main point with the first thing, then the third main point with lastingly, all of which may be used as conjunctions to sequence an argument (Collerson, 1994). One could also argue that then, as it occurs in the multi-resource conjunction, may be causal; however, after reconsidering the position of the conjunction, between it gets us what we need to know about the medicine that we’re making and it expands our knowledge of um the anatomy of the animal, it does not seem likely that then marks causality between the two main points.

Multi-resource conjunctions as potential disfluency in effective speeches

Speech G1 contains two instances of multi-resource conjunctions; one instance occurs as what appears to be a self-correction, and the other as a possible lapse in the speaker’s
delivery. The instance that seems to be a self-correction occurred in the final statement of the conclusion where the speaker suggests that the audience rent two movies in order to determine for themselves which character was better. In naming the two movies, the speaker correctly names the first of the two, but says *Weatherman* in naming the second movie. The use of *and/or* could be seen as the speaker offering a choice to the audience; however, the degree of background knowledge on the topic may influence the perception of the speaker’s use of *and or*. The excerpt is shown below.

*Speech G1*

**FS:** So I urge you all to go out and rent Old School and Weatherman *and or* Anchorman

and go see for yourself why it’s the best.

One can see from the example that the use of the two additive conjunctions may have resulted from self-correction as the speaker switches the conjunction to *or* to change the movie the speaker is referring to. The audio recording of the speech facilitated the decision of identifying the instance as self-correction or presenting an option. One can detect in the speaker’s voice and in the brief change in rate of speech that perhaps the speaker did not intend to offer an option, but to correct the utterance. The speaker then seems to resume using the same conjunction *and* as she may have intended initially moving into the final sentence of the speech. The other example *so uh also his underdog* seems to have occurred as a potential lapse in memory or in delivery. The speaker begins with the continuative *so* signaling that the speaker is “pressing on with the text,” a linguistic feature of spoken English, particularly conversation (Collerson, 1994, p. 136). The speaker then uses the verbal filler *uh* before adding *his underdog* with the conjunction *also*.

Looking back on the two speeches’ use of multi-resource conjunctions, one can notice how the different instances functioned in the argument—speech B1 relied on those
combinations as a resource for organizing the speech, albeit quite redundantly, whereas in G1’s speech, these appeared as either self-correction.

Temporal/Sequential

This section serves to draw attention to the use of temporal conjunctions to sequence the speakers’ arguments. To illustrate the difference in organizational strategy between the ineffective and effective speeches, speeches B1 and G1 will be used to note possible effects of maintaining or aborting the temporal sequencing of an argument.

Temporal/Sequential conjunctions and mismatch with logical sequencing in ineffective speeches

Speech B1 begins sequencing the main points of the argument in the preview using temporal conjunctions the first thing is first of all and and then the second thing, but introduces the third main point using the additive conjunction and. As the speaker progresses into the body of the speech, the speaker maintains usage of the temporal conjunctions for the first two points as well as incorporating the temporal conjunction Lastly to mark the third main point. Looking only at the use of temporal conjunctions, the speech appears well-organized; however, as one analyzes the content of the main points it becomes clear that an organizational strategy is lacking. Below is the thesis, preview, and first main point of speech B1.

Speech B1

T: You know, well unfortunately medical testing on animals is a necessity in life that has to be done.

P: Um the first thing is first of all we have to test medicine with um animals uh And then the second thing is it expands our knowledge of the anatomy of the animals and also the humans because humans and animals have a lot of similar body parts.

Um and we wouldn’t be where we are today with the technology and medicine we have today without having to do a little bit of animal um medical testing.

B: Um, the first thing, medical testing uh er, you have to uh medicine testing.
So we want to test on animals before we want to test on humans because humans have a lot I mean it’s not the same because most people love their animals and it’s not necessarily animals that we’re doing to people’s pets but still people have a problem with it.

In the excerpt from speech B1, the first thing to draw attention to is the first main point in the preview. The speaker seems to have restated the thesis as the first main point, and as the speaker moves into the body of the speech, there is not a clear focus to elaborate on the first main point, but rather the speaker starts main point one with a third statement of the thesis and continues to make unclear and contradictory statements until the sentence preceding the second main point, where the speaker arrives at but it gets us what we need to know about the medicine that we’re making, which seems to be the intended focus for the first main point.

*Temporal/Sequential pattern discontinued in effective speech G1*

To serve as an example of an effective speech initiating a sequence for the argument, but aborting that sequence, the body of speech G1 is shown below.

**Speech G1**

B: *Number one* is likeability  
We love him  
He is just somebody we just want to be his best friend  
You see him start out as the underdog and  
You see him come out as the person that you want to be on top  
His humor, who can forget the streaking scene  
I mean that just burns a memory, right?  
So uh also his underdog  
He starts off as that mild-mannered newlywed who is he is very submissive and does what his wife says but  
He finds himself throughout the movie and  
You see him take [unintelligible]

One can see that the speaker begins the body with *number one*, which seems to be a sign that the speaker will be sequencing the argument; however, she opts for merely stating the next main point without signaling its position within the argument. Based on the speech’s
placement in the effective group, it is possible that neglecting to maintain the temporal sequencing may not affect the audience’s or rater’s perception of effectiveness. To be able to claim that this phenomenon may not be of concern when considering effectiveness, though, would require further research.

Causal

The use of causal conjunctions, which commonly occur as conjunctions such as so, because, if, therefore, and consequently, mark a causal relationship between items (Collerson, 1994). The ineffective speeches tended to use more of these resources than the effective speeches—1.57 instances per 100 words in the ineffective speeches and 0.57 instances per 100 words in the effective speeches. To help illustrate the difference in usage between the two groups, speeches B3 and G2 will be analyzed for causal conjunctions. Speech B3 has a normed count of 1.53 occurrences per 100 words of causal conjunctions, and speech G2 has a normed count of 1.27 occurrences per 100 words.

Causal conjunctions used in circular arguments in ineffective speeches

Below is an excerpt from speech B3 consisting of the preview of main points, body, and conclusion. Instances of causal conjunctions will be marked in bold.

**Speech B3**

*P:* Um a lot of uh people under fifteen don’t understand a lot of social limits so while they’re out there scouring the internet they could be doing or they could be putting the wrong stuff out there uh like they could be talking to the wrong people, they could be giving out their location when they shouldn’t be and then also they could have negative effects on later in life

*B:* uh so talking to the wrong people uh whether it be through Facebook or other social media uh there are a lot of twisted people out there uh that want to do some really bad things so um if you enable people to get ahold of them, then that, I mean, you could just take away a lot of the risk from not allowing people to have er by not allowing people under fifteen to have Facebook pages uh that would also eliminate them giving out unnecessary locations, and then uh negative effects later in life.
I know that when I was fifteen or under fifteen I posted a lot of stupid stuff on my Facebook page to give them like my status for truth is all that stupid stuff uh a lot of employers would look uh would look back on Facebook pages when you’re looking for a job uh

RV: So if you don’t allow the risk that don’t need to happen then or if you don’t want if you don’t allow it to happen then those risks aren’t there later in life and

RS: you could eliminate those by not allowing kids under fifteen to have Facebook pages

The speaker in speech B3 seems to rely on if as the main causal conjunction for the speech with one instance of so marking causality. In the speaker’s use of if as a causal conjunction, he creates hypothetical situations that illustrate the cause-effect relationship that he wants to use for the argument; however, as he attempts to create a causal relationship, he seems to be forming a semantically null statement or circular argument where he states if you don’t allow [the risk], then those risks aren’t there later in life. Another way to view the relationship created would be if X, then X. It is also made clear by the excerpt that many of the uses of if do not signal a causal relationship, but are merely repetitions of the word.

_Causal conjunctions used successfully in effective speeches_

Speech G2 shows a raw count of four uses of causal conjunctions primarily through the conjunction because. The excerpt below shows the use of because to realize the causal relationship between the focus of the main point and the position being argued in the thesis.

_Speech G2:_

_B: According to Harvard law they saw a 48% decrease in their students’ stress levels because they allowed them to have their pets with them on campus. You can go into their library see a dog chilling next to a student studying for the BAR exam, but that kid is going to do great because they saw a 23% increase in their grades and their BAR exams because they allowed pets on campus.

Two of the instances of because connect the topics of the first two main points—stress levels and grades—to the presence of the student’s pet with the student on campus. The third
example seems to serve as an explanation for why *that kid is going to do great*, which connects to reasoning for the manner in which the student will do well.

**Higher use of continuatives in ineffective speeches**

Continuatives seemed to serve only a minor role in the two groups of speeches; however, the continuative conjunctions as they occurred in the speeches mostly took the form of a resource used to realize causal relationships, *so*. While this section does not aim to go into detail of all instances of the use of continuative conjunctions, the goal is to draw attention to the two preferred resources that mark the speaker’s continuation of the message: *anyway* and *so*. The first conjunction *anyway* is among the common examples that Collerson (1994) presented to illustrate continuative conjunctions. These conjunctions tend to occur more often in conversation as it may be more necessary to manage turns in speaking (Collerson, 1994). Thus the presence of continuative conjunctions helps further demonstrate the existence of impromptu speaking on a continuum showing that there are features of conversation as well as writing. The table below shows the use of continuative conjunctions across the six speeches.

**Table 4.9. Continuative Conjunction Counts Normed to 100 words.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for B</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for G</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the use of continuative conjunctions across the six speeches tended to vary between groups as well as between speeches of the same group. The
commonality between the groups is in the more frequent choice of continuative conjunction, which took the form of *so*. The conjunction *so* as a marker for continuation, or as a discourse marker, may also be used to mark causality. While it cannot be stated that the use of *so* was a source of confusion for the audience with regard to the speaker’s intended relationship of the content to the speech, it may be possible that overusing *so* as a continuative conjunction may desensitize the audience to that resource, and potentially result in decreased effectiveness in marking causality.

Looking at the linguistic resources for cohesion, the data show that effective speeches do not merely use cohesive resources, but they seem to use them to achieve a purpose, whereas ineffective speeches seemed to use cohesive devices without careful consideration of the effect the cohesive devices might have on the argument. Effective speeches tended to use more reference overall. Both groups of speeches involved similar numbers of lexical cohesion and conjunction resources; however, the ineffective speeches tended to use more synonymy, causal conjunctions, continuatives, and multi-resource conjunctions. The analysis of those linguistic features showed that, despite the increased frequency in the ineffective speeches, the effective speeches seemed to use them to create a better texture for the argument.

**RQ#2: How are theme/rheme progressions developed in effective and ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches?**

This section aims to analyze effective and ineffective speeches’ thematic development by looking at how theme and rheme progress throughout the speeches. To answer this research question, each of the speeches will be analyzed and presented to help
visualize the patterns that emerge in the speeches, starting with effective speeches and moving toward ineffective speeches.

**Successful thematic development in effective speeches through information flow**

Below is speech G1, and to facilitate visualization of the pattern of theme and rheme, arrows and underlining are used. Notice how the speaker develops the topic and direction of the speech by orienting the audience to the topic, providing a brief outline of the main points, adhering to the forecasted pattern, then closing the speech with a brief reiteration of the details of the speech.

**Figure 4.1. Thematic Progression in Speech G1.**

_Speech G1_

Of all the Will Ferrell characters the best ones are absolutely *Ron Burgundy* and *Frank the Tank*_

But I’m going to tell you today why Frank the Tank was **the best out of the two**

for three reasons: **his likability**, **his humor throughout the movie**, and **his underdog character**.

Number one is **likability**

We love him

He is just somebody we just want to be his best friend

You see him start out as the underdog

and you see him come out as the person that you want to be on top

His humor, who can forget the streaking scene

I mean that just burns a memory, right?

So ah also his **underdog**

He starts off as that mild-mannered newlywed who is he is very submissive and does what his wife says

but he finds himself throughout the movie

and you see him take [unintelligible]

So today I’ve told you why Frank the Tank is **the best Will Ferrell character**

We’ve gone over **likability**, **his humor**, and **being the underdog**

So I urge you all to go out and rent Old School and Weatherman and or Anchorman and

Go see for yourself why it’s the best
The analysis of speech G1 above does not account for all themes/rhemes in the speech, but supports how the speaker structures the line of meaning in her speech. Although the stages of the speech are not indicated in the example above, one can see how the speaker introduced the topic, stated the thesis, and outlined the main points of her argument. The arrows illustrate the speaker’s progress into the body of her speech with each main point stated and elaborated on in subsequent clauses. The conclusion can then be deduced by the speaker’s restatement of her thesis and main points before closing the speech with the final statement.

Speech G2 seemed to use a similar strategy as speech G1 despite differences in the order of stages and how the topics of the main points are introduced. Underlining and arrows are used to map the thematic development of the speech.

**Figure 4.2. Thematic Progression in Speech G2.**
Looking at the speaker’s thematic development, one can see that the structuring of the speech seems similar to that of speech G1 with the main points previewed in the introduction and elaborated on in the body; however, speech G2 deviates a bit from the expected pattern for the speech. The introduction begins with a question that addresses the idea of bringing pets to school, but instead of stating the thesis in the following stage, the speaker previews the main points that she will use in the argument. The speaker then moves to stating the thesis which contains the idea of bringing a pet to school along with the anaphoric reference *all these things* to claim that the items listed in the preview will be remedied by having a pet at school. Moving into the body and looking at how the speaker signals the main points, the speaker seems to be establishing the topic of the main point in the rheme of the clauses that cite percentages from studies. The speaker maintains that trend for the first two main points. The third main point is established, not within a clause, but rather as a noun group. After each main point, the speaker involves clauses to discuss the topic further. The conclusion can be deduced first by the temporal/sequential conjunction, and then by the reiteration of the information presented in the argument, starting with reviewing the main points, and providing a sense of closure by restating the thesis and providing a closing remark.

Speech G3 seems to follow a structure most similar to that of speech G1, but perhaps closer to the theme/rheme pattern of speech G2 with the topics of the main points in the body occurring in the rhemes of the clauses. Underlining and arrows are used to visualize the thematic development in the speech.
One can notice in the introduction of the speech that the speaker orients the audience to the topic and creates a need for considering the speaker’s thesis. The main points previewed in the introduction are also used in the body of the speech. The topic of each main point occurs later in the clause than in speech G1, similar to speech G2. The conclusion contains a similar structure to those of speeches G1 and G2.

The analysis of the effective speeches’ thematic development shows that despite some variation, all three speeches used a similar strategy in organizing their arguments. Speech G1 seemed to err on the side of brevity when establishing a new main point, while speeches G2 and G3 tended to include the topic of the main point late in the clause that established the main point. All three speeches seemed to employ a strategy to orient the audience to the topic, whether a statement was used or a question, the speakers seemed to
Failure to fully achieve thematic development in ineffective speeches

In analyzing the ineffective speeches, it seems that the speakers do not successfully develop their ideas from the introduction and into the body, and in some cases the conclusion seems to be insufficient in reiterating the important aspects of the speakers’ arguments.

Below is speech B1, and underlining and arrows will be used to illustrate thematic development.

Figure 4.4. Thematic Progression in Speech B1.
From tracking the ideas in speech B1, one can see an attempt at organization. The speaker begins similarly to the effective speeches by orienting the audience to the topic and stating the thesis; however, the speech becomes less clear as it moves into the preview and into the body. In the effective speeches, the preview seemed to contribute to the thematic development by providing a set of points that will be addressed in the speech. These points seemed to provide reasoning for the speakers’ arguments. The preview in speech B1 is a bit wordy and does not seem to provide an outline for the speaker’s line of argument, with the first main point being a repetition of the idea presented in the thesis. Each of the points presented in the preview are incorporated into the body of the speech, similar to the effective speeches. This speech differs once again, however, in its ability to stay on topic particularly in main point one and three where the speaker seems to get lost in discussing the topic. The conclusion can be deduced from the presence of a restatement of the thesis; however, it lacks the detail that was found in the effective speeches, such as a complete review of the main points, which seemed like an attempt to further develop the speaker’s ideas through the use of the additive conjunction and and the continuative so in the line containing and so uh that’s where we are today, which was marked as an attempt at reviewing the main points.

Below is speech B2. Speech B2 seems to follow a similar pattern to speech B1 with an opening strategy to orient the audience to the topic. The speech continues similarly to speech B1 in the preview, where the outline of the main points seems to contain more information than required such as the clause containing and if they fail. Underlining and arrows are used to help visualize the thematic development.
Figure 4.5. Thematic Progression in Speech B2.

*Speech B2*

Alright, how many people here have almost been in an accident or been in an accident because of an elderly person driving on the road?

I am here to um tell you why people over seventy years old or seventy year old should uh have driving tests uh each year should be mandatory.

Um for protecting others on the road and pedestrians, protecting themselves and if they fail, they shouldn’t be able to drive or they should be have to retest within so many months.

Um fifty percent of seventy years old uh get in a wreck each year and uh sorry um...uh

Uh anyway the reasons were um protecting themselves and the others in case they have eye problems or any disabilities.

they should have to be tested each year um

that’s protecting people on the road

and yeah they should have to get tested

thanks

Because of the length of the speech, the development of the speaker’s topics will be discussed from the preview through the end of the speech. The information in the preview points toward potentially three main points: protecting others on the road, pedestrians, and people over seventy. The speaker then adds the condition regarding the failure of the driving test, which seems out of place and possibly better suited for another stage of the speech. The speaker’s conclusion appears to make an attempt at meeting the expectations of the stages as well as concluding the speech through reiterating the main ideas, but insufficient in doing so.

Although this analysis does not address the ideational, or the “what,” it is noticeable that the lack of content in the speech seems to contribute to the difficulties in developing the speaker’s ideas.
Speech B3 appears to maintain the pattern of the ineffective speeches with regard to the preview of the main points, although, it also provides an example of additional difficulties that may be found in ineffective speeches particularly with thematic development.

**Figure 4.6. Thematic Progression in Speech B3.**

*Speech B3*

Alright, so just imagine you’re sitting there watching TV, all of the sudden your phone vibrates and up on your phone screen pops up Amber Alert.

Today I’m going to explain to you why I don’t think kids under fifteen shouldn’t have Facebook pages.

Um a lot of uh people under fifteen don’t understand a lot of social limits.

So while they’re out there scouring the internet they could be doing or they could be putting the wrong stuff out there uh like they could be talking to the wrong people, they could be giving out their location when they shouldn’t be.

And then also they could have negative effects on later in life uh.

So talking to the wrong people uh whether it be through Facebook or other social media uh there are a lot of twisted people out there uh that want to do some really bad things.

So um if you enable people to get a hold of them, then that, I mean, you could just take away a lot of the risk from not allowing people to have or by not allowing people under fifteen to have Facebook pages uh that would also eliminate them giving out unnecessary locations.

And then uh negative effects later in life.

I know that when I was fifteen or under fifteen I posted a lot of stupid stuff on my Facebook page to give them like my status for truth is all that stupid stuff uh a lot of employers would look uh would look back on Facebook pages when you’re looking for a job uh.

So if you don’t allow the risk that don’t need to happen then or if you don’t want if you don’t allow it to happen then those risks aren’t there later in life.

And you could eliminate those by not allowing kids under fifteen to have Facebook pages.

Looking at the introduction of the speech, one can notice a difference in how the speaker attempts to orient the audience to the topic. He creates a situation that indicates the potential for a problem; however, he seems to leap from the attention getter to the thesis without making the relationship between the situation he created and the thesis of his argument explicit, posing a difficulty for developing the topic of his speech. The relationship between the preview of the main points and the body appears to be the next area of concern. The
preview seems to contain more information than necessary to outline the main points of the speech, which appears to have been repeated in the body of the speech. Consequently, this serves as an issue for thematic development, leaving little room for a progression of given and new information in elaborating on the topics, especially in the first two main points. The third main point involves a shift where the speaker begins talking in the first person, offering anecdotal evidence to support the topic. The shift in theme to I appears to remove the focus from the issues that were presented in the earlier main points, which may also result in a perceived decrease in impersonality. Additionally, this shift to a more specific case is potentially problematic in its ability to directly support the claim being made by the speaker.

Martin (1989) stated regarding hortatory expositions, which are more commonly delivered orally, that “examples needed to be generalized, and related causally to the writer’s proposal” (p. 18). Perhaps, the main point need not be related causally to the thesis, but possibly the example used to support the main point in this case. The speaker used anecdotal evidence as an example to support the thesis, which in his speech could be an example of the problem that Martin (1989) discussed.

The analysis of the thematic development in the ineffective speeches has demonstrated that the ineffective speeches tended to have more difficulty in developing and maintaining a line of meaning. In some speeches the difficulty seemed to be in ensuring clarity and deliberateness in organizing the preview of the main points, the body, and conclusion as well as in making the relationships between stages clear such as between the attention getter and the thesis. The effective speeches, on the other hand, seemed more calculated in the speakers’ organizational strategies and thematic development through not only including the expected stages of the speech, but also in ensuring coherence.
**RQ#3: How is the language reflected in the rubric used for planning and evaluation?**

This section aims to analyze the levels of achievement of the rubric used to evaluate student impromptu speeches and to use examples from the ineffective and effective speeches to support some of the more subjective descriptors in the rubric. The rubric contains seven criteria: introduction, nonverbal communication, word choice and vocals, topic adaptation, organization, conclusion, and time. For the purpose of this study, the language of the levels of achievement for the introduction, organization, and conclusion will be analyzed in conjunction with the six speeches. While this section will mention appraisal language, it is outside the scope of this study to go into fine detail analyzing the use of appraisal language in the rubric. Rather, this section serves to connect the categories of cohesive language from the speeches to the levels of achievement in the rubric.

**Introduction**

In evaluating the introduction of the speech, the three expected stages of the introduction are also evaluated—attention getter, thesis, and preview. To help illustrate the differences in levels of achievement, the descriptors for each level of achievement are shown below in a table adapted from the rubric used in the basic course in communication at Iowa State University (see APPENDIX B).

**Table 4.10. Levels of Achievement for Evaluating Introductions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Excellent, effective attention getter; sound orientation to the topic; clear thesis; preview of main points specific and memorable.</td>
<td>Good attention getter; provides some orientation to the topic; discernible thesis; provides a general preview of main points.</td>
<td>Attention getter is mundane or cliché, awkwardly composed or unclear thesis; provides an unclear organization and little direction for the audience.</td>
<td>Irrelevant opening or no opening technique; abrupt jump into body of speech; thesis or main points can be deduced but are not explicitly stated.</td>
<td>No opening technique, thesis statement, or preview of main points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 4.10 shows, each level of achievement for assessing a speaker’s introduction contains descriptors characterizing the expected stages and goals of the introduction. Achievement level 0 signifies the absence of the stages of the introduction and failure to meet the expectations of an introduction, whereas achievement levels 1 through 4 contain descriptors from a gradient of appraisal language such as excellent, good, and mundane. One thing to note in achievement level 1 is the use of irrelevant, abrupt, and not explicitly stated. The descriptors irrelevant and abrupt, while somewhat subjective, can be demonstrated through a theme/rheme analysis tracking the development of a topic through a progression of incorporating new and given information which can be used to remedy the perception of irrelevance or abruptness. The excerpt below demonstrates an instance where the topic in the attention getter does not explicitly link with the thesis.

**Speech B3**
AG: Alright, so just imagine you’re sitting there watching t.v. all of the sudden your phone vibrates and up on your phone screen pops up Amber Alert.
T: Today I’m going to explain to you why I don’t think kids under fifteen shouldn’t have Facebook pages.
P: Um a lot of uh people under fifteen don’t understand a lot of social limits so while they’re out there scouring the internet they could be doing or they could be putting the wrong stuff out there uh like they could be talking to the wrong people, they could be giving out their location when they shouldn’t be and then also they could have negative effects on later in life uh

The speaker seems to be linking the idea of people under fifteen having Facebook pages to child abduction; however, in setting the context for the argument in the attention getter, the speaker does not fully orient the audience to the topic. A possible approach to remedying the seeming irrelevance of the situation to the thesis could be to incorporate some of the given information from the attention getter into the thesis, or to add another sentence to the attention getter to better link to the topic of the speech to the context that was created through
building a connection between child abduction and accessibility of social media to people under fifteen. To provide contrast to the excerpt from the ineffective speeches, the excerpt below is from speech G1 and demonstrates clarity and conciseness.

**Speech G1**

_AG:_ Of all the Will Ferrell characters the best ones are absolutely Ron Burgundy and Frank the Tank

_T:_ But I’m going to tell you today why Frank the Tank was the best out of the two for three

_P:_ reasons: his likeability, his humor throughout the movie, and his underdog character.

Looking in order of the stages of the introduction, one can see that the speaker’s strategy for beginning the speech involved orienting the audience to the topic a bit more than attempting to capture the audience’s attention. The thesis used includes the topic and position for the argument presented in the speech. The speaker also makes use of the adversative conjunction *but* to mark contrast between the two best Will Ferrell characters, introduced in the attention getter, and *the best of the two* which was the focus of the argument. The preview of the speech not only signals the main points to be discussed in the speech, but provides the audience with a glimpse of the organizational pattern of the speech as well. To comment further on the alignment of the example with the rubric, the speaker seems to reduce the content of each main point to a short noun group that serves as a label representing the content that will be expanded on in the body of the speech. By limiting the length of the noun groups used to forecast the direction of the speech, the speaker seems to avoid excessive redundancy, which is a needed area of improvement for speech B3.

**Organization**

The criterion of organization seems to be the most involved of the rubric criteria. In evaluating organization, a rater seems to be also rating the speaker’s reasoning, word choice,
and delivery in addition to the structure of the speech. Below is a table adapted from the rubric used to evaluate impromptu speeches in the basic course in communication at Iowa State University.

**Table 4.11. Levels of Achievement for Evaluating Organization.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Very well organized; main points are clear, mutually exclusive and directly related to thesis and main points are previewed in the introduction; transitions between main points exhibit exceptional use of connectives; movement between points is effortless for the audience.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern is evident, main points are apparent; transitions are present between main points.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern somewhat evident; main points are present but not mutually exclusive or exactly as previewed; transitions are present but are minimally effective.</td>
<td>Speech did not flow well; speech was not logically organized; transitions are present but not well formed.</td>
<td>No organizational pattern; no transitions; sounds as if information was randomly presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the descriptors used for the levels of achievement for organization, the role of transitions and main points seem to be valued the most. The highest level of achievement requires not only transitions and main points, but also that the main points occur in the same order in which they were previewed in the introduction, meaning that earning a 4 in organization also requires that the speaker has a preview. As the preview forecasts the content and organization, it follows that the organization of the main points should reflect the order intended by the speaker, which may also facilitate listening for the audience. The rubric also makes mention of ensuring the main points are mutually exclusive and are directly in support of the thesis, getting at reasoning in a way. The reasoning used in speech B1 to argue
for testing medicine on animals did not follow the requirements to achieve top marks in organization because the first main point presented in the preview was a restatement of the thesis, and as the speech moved into the body, the thesis was repeated again. Thus, the speech attempted to support the thesis with the thesis. Speech B2 would thus also be marked down for organization for lacking content to organize in the body.

The effective speeches used the preview to introduce the main points intended to support the arguments. Each speech seemed to use a slightly different approach to organizing the main points, with speech G1 initiating a numerical sequencing of the main points, but aborting following the first main point to continue with stating the next topic and expanding on it; speech G2 utilized additive conjunctions not only that to transition to a new main point, which seemed to work for their argument as the speaker continued to add more reasons to support the thesis; speech G3 used additive conjunctions another reason to introduce additional main points. Something to note regarding the difference in additive conjunction in speeches G2 and G3 is that another reason always occurred as a participant in the sentence, whereas, not only that does not serve as a participant. The use of not only that seems to function better as a link between main points as it includes the previous information condensed into the demonstrative that, and shows a shift from the previous idea to the next. Using another reason can make the speech seem more disjointed as it leaps from main point to main point.

Conclusion

In looking at the rubric’s levels of achievement for the criterion of conclusion, one can notice similarities with the introduction descriptors. The table below shows the levels of
achievement and the descriptors thereof adapted from the rubric used in the basic course in communication at Iowa State University.

**Table 4.12. Levels of Achievement for Evaluating the Conclusion.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Refers back to thesis; provides a clear and memorable summary of main points; ends with strong closing statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some reference back to the thesis; appropriate summary of points; clear closing statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No clear reference back to thesis or thesis is articulated for the first time; provides some summary of points; closing technique needs to be strengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conclusion lacks clarity, trails off, and/or ends in a tone at odds with the rest of the speech, or abruptly without closure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two levels of achievement that seem to contain subjective descriptors that may result in uncertainty in raters and students would be levels 3 and 4 with the use of **strong closing statement**, **memorable summary**, and **appropriate summary of points**. In some speeches, the final statement contains a call to action or a statement to motivate the audience to use the information that was presented such as in speeches G1 and G2 where the speaker provides a call to action. Speech B1 seems to attempt creating a clear closing statement; however, it comes across as the speaker stating an opinion on the topic rather than providing a sense of closure. The speaker in speech B1 then follows the final statement with a restatement of the thesis, which may have further affected the impact of the final statement. In four of the six speeches, the speaker used a different ordering of the stages in the conclusion. The two speeches with the expected order were in the effective group, with one speech in the effective group with a different ordering of the stages. Of all of the speeches that used a different order of stages, all of them started with the review stage and moved to the restatement of the thesis—the one exception being in speech B1. Some questions that remain to be answered...
are what makes a review “memorable,” and what makes a final statement “strong”? Using the effective speeches as models, and assuming the speeches were high achieving in the conclusion, a memorable review might be most closely rephrased as accurate and concise consisting of perhaps short word groups that can represent the topics of the main points. Of the effective speeches, speeches G1 and G3 used the same three nouns that were used in their previews for their review. Speech G2 used a slightly different approach where the preview consisted of three nouns that would be the focus of the three main points; however, the review contained three clauses parallel in structure, each of which would be used the complement pets in general will help people.

This section looked at the linguistic features of the six speeches and attempted to align those feature with the levels of achievement of the organizational and structural criteria of the rubric. Whereas the rubric uses somewhat generalized and subjective terms, having concrete examples to show students and raters is highly useful as it provides an element of specificity.

This chapter has presented and illustrated the textual resources the effective and ineffective speeches used and connected these with the relevant aspects of the assessment rubric in an attempt to make the language of the rubric less abstract. The next chapter will summarize the current research and draw connections to the literature. Chapter five will also contain a discussion of the limitations as well as implications and directions for future research.
This study served as an exploratory discourse analysis of persuasive impromptu speeches to identify the linguistic features that occur in effective and ineffective speeches from a systemic functional linguistic perspective. The analysis focused on the textual metafunction and identified and described the uses of cohesive devices and the impact of the speaker’s linguistic choices on the organization and content of the speech. In responding to the research questions, the analysis also attempted to align the characteristics of the impromptu speeches with the SFL mode continuum of spoken language to further illustrate the non-dichotomous nature of the continuum by demonstrating how effective and ineffective speeches both contained features of more conversational-style English as well as the structure and organization of a more written style. Among the conversational features of the speeches, both groups relied on reference resources such as pronouns and demonstratives that would be appropriate for more a context dependent situation for communication. The effective speeches seemed to make better use of the reference resources by ensuring the referent was clear for the audience. The ineffective speeches, on the other hand, used reference resources, but did not always make clear the referent. Overall the effective speeches made more use of cohesive devices—reference, ellipses/substitution, lexical cohesion, and conjunction. Although the ineffective speeches contained total counts similar to those of the effective speeches, the specific types of cohesive devices preferred were different. To draw attention to some of the differences, the ineffective speeches used more synonymy, causal conjunctions, temporal conjunctions, and continuative conjunctions. Through the analysis of how the ineffective speeches used these resources, the discussion showed that presence of a
cohesive device did not always appear to correlate with successful use, such as in the use of causal conjunctions where the relationship between ideas was not causal, and the use of temporal conjunctions to sequence an argument in situations where the first main point was a restatement of the thesis. Language choice, particularly with regard to synonymy in ineffective speeches versus effective speeches, may be connected to a developmental path. In reference to the citation of claims in academic writing, Hyland (2008) argued that the lack of vocabulary development could be the cause of inappropriate use despite otherwise correct grammatical choices. His comments were regarding non-native speakers of English and the difficulties they have in understanding rhetorical strategies; however, Hyland’s comments seem to be relevant to the current research as well. The successful use of cohesive devices in the effective speeches seemed to align closer with written language, where the context is likely not shared between the writer and the audience. The speakers in the effective group made use of their cohesive resources as well as first and second person pronouns to clearly organize their speeches and maintain a more conversational tone with the audience, potentially promoting an image of talking with the audience rather than talking at the audience.

The second research question dealt with thematic development in the speeches through analyzing theme and rheme in the clauses. The results showed that the effective speeches tended to better develop their ideas better than the ineffective speeches. The effective speeches involved a progression of given and new information to give the speech direction and to facilitate organization. The ineffective speeches seemed to lack a consistent pattern of given and new information with occasional gaps between stages, potentially leading to diminished clarity.
The third research question discussed the language of the rubric and how the subjective language of the descriptors could be reflected in the speeches. By comparing the effective speeches with the higher levels of achievement, and the ineffective speeches with the lower levels of achievement, the analysis was able to shed light on the possible linguistic choices students can make to meet the expectations of certain levels of achievement. It cannot be said with certainty that the linguistic features present in the speeches are paragons of the subjective descriptors; however, if the connection can be made between effectiveness and higher levels of achievement, the analysis of the effective speeches may inform instruction and feedback for speeches. In any case, having actual examples of effective and ineffective speeches can help students see concrete usage instead of struggling as novices to understand the more generic language of the rubric.

The findings of the current research connect with the SFL research reviewed in this thesis with regard to some of the motivations for research as well as with some of the findings of previous research. Schreiber et al. (2012) aimed to design a versatile rubric in response to the need for a more precise assessment rubric, and Fang and Wang (2011) used SFL to supplement rubric-based assessment to raise linguistic awareness for feedback and instruction. Fang and Wang’s research used a functional language analysis to provide insight into the language patterns that made a text effective. Mohan (2001) analyzed a basic writer’s and a skilled writer’s classification essays, and he found that the two writers used basically the same information; however, they made different discourse decisions and shaped the information in their texts very differently, with the skilled writer better reflecting the expectations of the classification essay genre. Huang and Morgan’s (2003) research also analyzed student classification essays from an SFL perspective and noticed an increase in
linguistic sophistication in the students’ later drafts, adding importance to moving beyond what the students are producing and towards how students are holding their thoughts together. Mohan and Slater (2005) analyzed classroom discourse and showed how the teacher helped the students move from less effective causal explanations to more appropriate, effective ones. Mohan and Slater (2006) also looked at causal explanations and the development of science knowledge and language. They argued for the importance of being intentional and systematic with language to facilitate development of language and content, bring about the idea that every learner is a language learner. The findings of the current research indicated that it was not the presence of the linguistic feature that was important, but it was how the linguistic feature was used that contributed to effectiveness by creating a more effective discourse texture.

The concept of genre was also considered in this study. As the rubric divides the parts of the speech into goal-oriented stages, it seemed appropriate to align the products of the persuasive impromptu speeches with arguing genres to determine what genre the students tend to produce as well as what genre seems to be preferred by the instructor and the rubric. Of the effective group, two speeches seemed to reflect the staging expected of an hortatory exposition where the speaker uses a thesis, evidence, reinforcement of the thesis, and a recommendation. This genre differs from the analytical exposition in that the analytical exposition does not characteristically use the recommendation stage (Coffin, 2004). Referring back to the discussion on conclusions and final statements, it would seem that the preferred final statements are those that provide some recommendation or some call to action. The speeches that did not have a final statement, or perhaps used one unsuccessfully, seem to fit closer with the analytical exposition. Martin (1989) commented on the alignment
of modes with those two arguing genres, and stated that hortatory expositions are closer to
spoken language, and analytical expositions are closer to writing. As this study shows, that
distinction may not always hold true, especially in situations such as this, where impromptu
speaking includes features of both spoken and written language.

This study was important for its role in expanding the existing knowledge base and
interdisciplinary work. The findings of this research may be used in teaching English as a
second language, public speaking in the basic course in communication, and for teaching
general organizational skills in oral language production. The data used in the current study
were persuasive impromptu speeches taken from a basic course in communication.
Therefore, the findings are directly related to that course, but being required to speak with
little preparation time occurs outside of the basic course in communication. Teaching non-
native and native speakers effective use of cohesive language and strategies for achieving
coherence will benefit their general speaking skills as well as their ability to create meaning
effectively.

Limitations

The main limitation of this study lies in its small sample size. The data consisted of
six speeches—three effective and three ineffective—collected from two sections taught in
the same semester by the same instructor. This affects the generalizability of the results and
implications; however, the goal of the research was to analyze for linguistic features present
in the samples provided by the instructor and to see how these features align with the
language of the assessment rubric. Thus, the findings cannot be used to make sweeping
claims, but rather to claim that the features tended to occur in the sample of effective and
ineffective speeches. Such a study is imperative as a first step towards a broader corpus-
based study, especially when the findings showed that it was more how the features were used rather than their numbers, which complements Mohan, Leung, and Slater’s (2010) statement that “SFL does not consider the text as a display of language resources, but sees it as meaning making using the resources of the language system in context” (p. 230).

Another possible limitation was in determining instances of collocation in the data, which was excluded due to difficulties in determining what constituted collocation in the length of speech being analyzed. Collerson (1994) noted that collocation is not a precise relationship; therefore, with one of the goals of the current research to quantify instances of cohesive devices, it seemed justified to focus on including the more salient items.

**Implications**

*Implications for teachers and designers*

Implications of this study for teachers and designers may be in guiding evaluation, feedback, and development of speeches in the basic course in communication as well as other courses that may require presentations. Students may benefit from guidance by drawing attention to deliberately choosing language to serve an intended function, particularly in organizing the speech to facilitate comprehension for the audience as well as in structuring an argument to enhance the speaker’s reasoning. For rubric design, this study may serve as a starting place for others to consider the language features that justify associating levels of achievement with certain speeches especially when a potential difference in score depends on the interpretation of the vague, abstract descriptors in the rubric. Connecting linguistic features to the rubric may facilitate training of speech raters to enhance consistency within a rater as well as between raters. Looking back at Ardito (1999), who discussed the role of impromptu speaking in training interpreters, it would appear that drawing attention to
features that occur in effective and ineffective speeches may further promote flexibility in the
ovice interpreter’s command of the language. Potentially being aware of differences in
effectiveness in impromptu speeches could serve as an additional training tool to reflect real-
world situations where a speaker may not be adept at speaking publicly in an impromptu
style.

*Future Directions*

For researchers, this study demonstrates some of the nuances of impromptu speaking
that may be better investigated with systemic functional linguistics. The results of this study
focused on cohesion; further work needs to be carried out on other linguistic features such as
resources from the interpersonal and ideational metafunctions. To perhaps take a more
complete look at impromptu speaking, researchers may notice varying strategies for creating
and maintaining intimacy/distance, objectivity/emotion, and conversational/academic tone. In
responding to those aspects, researchers should also take into consideration prosodics and
nonverbal communication to fully describe a speaker’s interpersonal resources in impromptu
speaking.

This exploratory discourse analysis has provided insight into the cohesive resources
that occur in effective and ineffective persuasive impromptu speeches, and it serves as a
starting place for future research in analyzing discourse, rubric design, and rater training. To
work eventually toward making more generalizable claims about the linguistic resources
students and people in general use in addition to what is expected of them, research should
seek larger data sets and continue to promote finding evidence in the language to support
some of the more abstract and vague expectations of impromptu speaking. Future research
should involve bringing in research on the value of signaling words in text, for example the conjunctions discussed in this thesis as well as other transitional phrases.
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Speech G1:
Of all the Will Ferrell characters the best ones are absolutely Ron Burgundy and Frank the Tank
But I’m going to tell you today why Frank the Tank was the best out of the two for three reasons: his likeability, his humor throughout the movie, and his underdog character.
Number one is likeability
We love him
He is just somebody we just want to be his best friend
You see him start out as the underdog and
You see him come out as the person that you want to be on top
His humor, who can forget the streaking scene
I mean that just burns a memory, right?
So uh also his underdog
He starts off as that mild-mannered newlywed who is he is very submissive and does what his wife says but
He finds himself throughout the movie and
You see him take [unintelligible]
So today I’ve told you why Frank the Tank is the best Will Ferrell character
We’ve gone over likeability, his humor, and being the underdog
So I urge you all to go out and rent Old School and Weatherman and or Anchorman and
Go see for yourself why it’s the best

Speech G2:
How can you feel overwhelmed when you have your pet with you at school?
Are you worried about your stress levels, your grades, or your anxiety?
But with a pet at school in particular maybe a dog you can manage all these things.
According to Harvard law they saw a 48% decrease in their students’ stress levels because they allowed them to have their pets with them on campus. You can go into their library see a dog chilling next to a student studying for the BAR exam,
But that kid is going to do great because they saw a 23% increase in their grades and their BAR exams because they allowed pets on campus.
Not only that Marquette University also saw an astounding 52% increase in their students’ grades when they allowed them to bring their cat and their dogs with them to the library, school.
Their only exception is not in the cafeteria
You know, dogs get a little crazy around food.
Not only that, your anxiety levels.
I know when I’m getting ready for a big test finals week I get nervous, I get anxious, and I’m just over the top just I need something to help me calm down.
And that’s when I wish I had my dog with me on campus. He always knows when I’m a little upset, nervous, anxious.
While he might not be the best to comfort me.
He usually tries to bite my feet.
He knows that that little distraction will help me calm down and do better.
And in conclusion, pets in general will help people improve in their grades, lower their stress levels, and help them manage their anxiety.
If nothing else, it’ll give them a friend on campus
because like they said, dogs are a man’s best friend.
And if you’re ever without a friend bring your pet to school.

Speech G3:
How long did it take you to pick your clothes this morning?
5 minutes, 10 minutes, 15?
That’s a lot of time to waste in the morning.
And one solution uh to this is if you have uh school uniforms.
Reasons why students should have school uniforms is to save time, money, and to be better involved in the school.
One of the reasons um having school uniforms is beneficial is for the time factor.
Every morning you spend so much time picking out your clothes and figuring out what to wear when you can better spend your time focusing on (indistinguishable) things like cramming for that next test.
Another reason is money.
Students today spend a lot of money on expensive designer clothing and trendy outfits when they can be cost-savvy and buy uniforms.
You don’t have to have designer this and trendy that, and
You can just wear the required uniforms to school.
Another reason is uh school uniforms make uh make students feel more uh community-sensed in their classrooms.
All their classmates are wearing the same thing and having the same uniforms. This makes them feel this makes them feel more unified with their classroom.
In conclusion, um all students should wear school uniforms.
This is beneficial for both their time, money, and social factors.
Thank you

Speech B1:
Alright, how many of you guys own a pet, your very own pet?
Alright, how many of you guys would like to give that pet up for medical testing?
You know, well unfortunately medical testing on animals is a necessity in life that has to be done.
Um the first thing is first of all we have to test medicine with um animals uh
And then the second thing is it expands our knowledge of the anatomy of the animals and also the humans because humans and animals have a lot of similar body parts.
Um and we wouldn’t be where we are today with the technology and medicine we have today without having to do a little bit of animal um medical testing. 
Um the first thing, medical testing uh er, you have to uh medicine testing. So we want to test on animals before we want to test on humans because humans have a lot I mean it’s not the same because most people love their animals and it’s not necessarily animals that we’re doing to people’s pets but still people have a problem with it. But it gets us what we need to know about the medicine that we’re making. Uh and then secondly it expands our knowledge of um the anatomy of the animal, the anatomy of the human body, expands our knowledge of more medicines uh the effects of medicines on certain animals compared to other animals. Um and lastly we wouldn’t be where we are today with the medicine testing on, we have so many medicines that can cure different things and you know back in the day when somebody lost a leg or something like that they were probably gonna die because of the infection or because of lack of medication because of various viruses um bacteria things like that. And so uh that’s where we are today um and that’s because we’re there because of animal testing. Um it may not be something that is really necessarily moral um but we have to try to keep it humane you know uh that’s what I would like to do so um medical testing is a necessity in uh in life.

Speech B2:
Alright, how many people here have almost been in an accident or been in an accident because of an elderly person driving on the road? I am here to um tell you why people over seventy year olds er seventy years old should uh have driving tests uh each year should be mandatory. Um for protecting others eh on the road and pedestrians, protecting themselves and if they fail, they shouldn’t be able to drive or they should be have to retest within so many months. Um fifty percent of seventy year olds uh get in a wreck each year and uh sorry um…uh Uh anyway the reasons were um protecting themselves and the others in case um they have eye problems or any disabilities they should have to be tested each year um that’s protecting people on the road and yeah they should have to get tested thanks

Speech B3:
Alright, so just imagine you’re sitting there watching tv all of the sudden your phone vibrates and up on your phone screen pops up Amber Alert. Today I’m going to explain to you why I don’t think kids under fifteen shouldn’t have Facebook pages. Um a lot of uh people under fifteen don’t understand a lot of social limits so while they’re out there scouring the internet they could be doing or they could be putting the wrong stuff out there uh like they could be talking to the wrong people,
they could be giving out their location when they shouldn’t be and then also they could have negative effects on later in life uh
So talking to the wrong people uh whether it be through Facebook or other social media uh there are a lot of twisted people out there uh that want to do some really bad things so um if you enable people to get ahold of them, then that, I mean, you could just take away a lot of the risk from not allowing people to have er by not allowing people under fifteen to have Facebook pages uh that would also eliminate them giving out unnecessary locations, and then uh negative effects later in life.
I know that when I was fifteen or under fifteen I posted a lot of stupid stuff on my Facebook page to give them like my status for truth is all that stupid stuff uh a lot of employers would look uh would look back on Facebook pages when you’re looking for a job uh
So if you don’t allow the risk that don’t need to happen then er if you don’t want if you don’t allow it to happen then those risks aren’t there later in life and you could eliminate those by not allowing kids under fifteen to have Facebook pages
## APPENDIX B

**IMPROPTU SPEECH ASSESSMENT RUBRIC (LeFebvre, 2015)**

### IMPROPTU 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Excellent, effective attention getter; sound orientation to topic; clear thesis; preview of main points specific and memorable.</td>
<td>Good attention getter; provides some orientation to topic; discernible thesis; provides a general preview of main points.</td>
<td>Attention getter is mundane or clichés; awkwardly composed or unclear thesis; provides an unclear organization and little direction for audience.</td>
<td>Irrelevant opening or no opening technique; abrupt jump into body of speech; thesis or main points can be deduced but are not explicitly stated.</td>
<td>No opening technique, thesis statement, or preview of main points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonverbal Communication</strong></td>
<td>Posture, gestures, movement, facial expression, and eye contact well developed, natural, and display high levels of poise and confidence.</td>
<td>Posture, gestures, and facial expressions are suitable for speech, speaker appears confident.</td>
<td>Some overreliance on notes but has adequate eye contact, generally avoiding distracting mannerisms.</td>
<td>Speaker relies heavily on notes; nonverbal expression stilted and unnatural or distracts from or contradicts message.</td>
<td>Usually looks down and avoids eye contact; nervous gestures and nonverbal behaviors distract from or contradict the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word Choice and Vocal</strong></td>
<td>Language is exceptionally clear, economical, imaginative and vivid; completely free from bias, grammatical errors and inappropriate usage. Excellent use of vocal variation, intonation, pacing, and pauses; vocal expression natural and authentic; avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).</td>
<td>Language appropriate to the goals of the presentation; no conspicuous errors in grammar; no evidence of bias. Good vocal variation and pace; vocal expression suited to assignment; tone generally has a conversational quality; few if any fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).</td>
<td>Language selection adequate; some errors in grammar; language at times imprecise (e.g., jargon, slang, awkward structure). Demonstrates some vocal variation; associates clearly and speaks clearly; monotone at times; generally avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).</td>
<td>Grammar and syntax need to be improved as can lead to language simplification, occasionally biased. Sometimes uses voice too soft or articulation too indistinct for listeners to understand his/her voice. Often uses fillers (e.g., um, uh, like); pace difficult to follow or inappropriate for audience.</td>
<td>Many errors in grammar and syntax; extensive use of jargon, slang, sexist or racist terms or mispronunciations. Speaks incoherently; associates poorly; speaks in monotone; poor pacing; distracts listeners with fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Adequacy</strong></td>
<td>Topic engages audience; topic is well adapted, worthwhile, timely, and presents information in an interesting manner to the audience.</td>
<td>Topic is appropriately adapted to the audience and situation and provides some useful information to the audience.</td>
<td>Topic needs further adaptation; provides some new information to audience.</td>
<td>Topic is not adapted; feels too trivial, too complex, or inappropriate for audience.</td>
<td>A single topic cannot be deduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Vary well organized; main points are clear; mutually exclusive and directly related to thesis and main points are previewed in the introduction; transitions between main points exhibit exceptional use of connectives; movement between points is effortless for the audience.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern is evident; main points are apparent; transitions are present between main points.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern somewhat evident; main points are present but not mutually exclusive or explicitly stated; transitions are present but are minimally effective.</td>
<td>Speech did not flow well; organization was not logically developed; transitions are present but not well formed.</td>
<td>No organizational pattern; no transitions; sounded as if information was randomly presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>Refers back to thesis; provides a clear and memorable summary of main points; ends with strong closing statement.</td>
<td>Some reference back to thesis; appropriate summary of points; clear closing statement.</td>
<td>No clear reference back to thesis or thesis is articulated for the first time; provides some summary of points; closing technique needs to be strengthened.</td>
<td>Conclusion lacks clarity, trails off, and/or ends in a tone off-key with the rest of the speech, or abruptly without closure.</td>
<td>No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Time | Presentation conforms to the time specification – falling anywhere between 1:00 and 2:00 minutes in length. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| TOTAL POINTS | 25 |