



ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PRESENTATION



Herminus Efrando Pabur, M.Pd
Ismail, S.Pd., M.Hum
Sabrina Wardatul Jannah Husain, S.Pd., M.A
Muhammad Ilham Ali, S.S., M.Pd
Yayu Anggraini H. Katili, M.Pd

Editor: Mochamad Arief Komarudin, M.Pd

ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PRESENTATION

Herminus Efrando Pabur, M.Pd.

Ismail, S.Pd., M.Hum.

Sabrina Wardatul Jannah Husain, S.Pd., M.A.

Muhammad Ilham Ali, S.S., M.Pd.

Yayu Anggraini H. Katili, M.Pd.



Tahta Media Group

UU No 28 tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta

Fungsi dan sifat hak cipta Pasal 4

Hak Cipta sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 3 huruf a merupakan hak eksklusif yang terdiri atas hak moral dan hak ekonomi.

Pembatasan Pelindungan Pasal 26

Ketentuan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 23, Pasal 24, dan Pasal 25 tidak berlaku terhadap:

- i. penggunaan kutipan singkat Ciptaan dan/atau produk Hak Terkait untuk pelaporan peristiwa aktual yang ditujukan hanya untuk keperluan penyediaan informasi aktual;
- ii. Penggandaan Ciptaan dan/atau produk Hak Terkait hanya untuk kepentingan penelitian ilmu pengetahuan;
- iii. Penggandaan Ciptaan dan/atau produk Hak Terkait hanya untuk keperluan pengajaran, kecuali pertunjukan dan Fonogram yang telah dilakukan Pengumuman sebagai bahan ajar; dan
- iv. penggunaan untuk kepentingan pendidikan dan pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan yang memungkinkan suatu Ciptaan dan/atau produk Hak Terkait dapat digunakan tanpa izin Pelaku Pertunjukan, Produser Fonogram, atau Lembaga Penyiaran.

Sanksi Pelanggaran Pasal 113

1. Setiap Orang yang dengan tanpa hak melakukan pelanggaran hak ekonomi sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 9 ayat (1) huruf i untuk Penggunaan Secara Komersial dipidana dengan pidana penjara paling lama 1 (satu) tahun dan/atau pidana denda paling banyak Rp100.000.000 (seratus juta rupiah).
2. Setiap Orang yang dengan tanpa hak dan/atau tanpa izin Pencipta atau pemegang Hak Cipta melakukan pelanggaran hak ekonomi Pencipta sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 9 ayat (1) huruf c, huruf d, huruf f, dan/atau huruf h untuk Penggunaan Secara Komersial dipidana dengan pidana penjara paling lama 3 (tiga) tahun dan/atau pidana denda paling banyak Rp500.000.000,00 (lima ratus juta rupiah).

Hak cipta dilindungi undang-undang
Dilarang keras menerjemahkan, memfotokopi, atau memperbanyak sebagian atau seluruh isi buku ini tanpa izin tertulis dari Penerbit.

ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PRESENTATION

Authors:

Herminus Efrando Pabur, M.Pd.
Ismail, S.Pd., M.Hum.
Sabrina Wardatul Jannah Husain, S.Pd., M.A.
Muhammad Ilham Ali, S.S., M.Pd.
Yayu Anggraini H. Katili, M.Pd.

Cover Design:

Tahta Media

Editor:

Mochamad Arief Komarudin, M.Pd

Proofreader:

Tahta Media

Size:

viii, 345, Uk: 15,5 x 23 cm

ISBN: 978-634-262-226-1

First Print:

July 2026

Copyright 2026, On Author

Fill out the responsibility of printing

Copyright © 2026 by Tahta Media Group

All Right Reserved

PENERBIT TAHTA MEDIA GROUP

Perumahan Mitra Utama Residence 3 Blok A no 1, Sawahan, Tempel,

Kec. Gatak, Kabupaten Sukoharjo, Jawa Tengah 57557

email: tahtaliterasimedia@gmail.com

website: <http://store.tahtamedia.co.id/>

IKAPI Member (216/JTE/2021)

PREFACE

Standing before an audience to present your research can be exhilarating and terrifying in equal measure. Most of us spend years learning how to conduct research but receive remarkably little training in how to present that research effectively. We assume presentation skills will somehow develop naturally, yet they rarely do. This gap between research competence and presentation confidence affects students preparing for their first conference, international scholars presenting in English, and even seasoned researchers seeking to enhance their impact. *English for Academic Presentation* addresses this need by offering systematic, evidence-based guidance on every aspect of academic presentation: from understanding your audience and structuring your content to designing effective visuals and managing performance anxiety.

This book progresses logically from fundamental principles to specialized applications. Early chapters establish foundations: what makes academic presentations unique, how to craft openings that engage and closings that resonate, and how to create visual aids that clarify rather than confuse. Middle chapters address delivery skills often overlooked in academic training: vocal techniques, body language, and strategies for managing presentation anxiety. Later chapters explore specialized formats (conference presentations, poster sessions, dissertation defenses, and group presentations) each with distinct conventions and challenges. The final chapter examines advanced skills: adapting across disciplines, mastering virtual presentation environments, and building your academic presence strategically.

Our goal is not to transform you into a polished performer but to help you communicate your ideas so effectively that they influence

thinking and advance knowledge. Presentation skills are learnable competencies that improve through understanding, practice, and reflection. Whether you're preparing for your first presentation or your hundredth, we hope this book provides practical strategies you can apply immediately and frameworks for continued growth throughout your academic career. Your research matters; let's ensure your presentations do it justice.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Preface.....	iv
Table of Content	vi
Course Description and Learning Objectives	1
Chapter 1 Foundations of Academic Presentation	7
Learning Objectives:.....	7
Introduction.....	7
Understanding Academic Presentations.....	9
Presentation Structure and Organization.....	12
Academic Language and Register.....	18
Research and Content Preparation	25
Evaluation.....	35
Summary.....	39
Chapter 2 Developing Strong Openings and Closings	41
Learning Objectives:.....	41
Introduction.....	42
Effective Introduction Techniques	43
Thesis Statements and Research Questions	49
Powerful Conclusions.....	57
Handling Q&A Sessions	62
Evaluation.....	68
Summary.....	72
Chapter 3 Visual Aids and Slide Design	74
Learning Objectives:.....	74
Introduction.....	74
Principles of Effective Slide Design	76
Using Data Visualization.....	83
Incorporating Multimedia.....	90
Referencing Visual Sources	97

Evaluation.....	103
Summary.....	107
Chapter 4 Delivery Skills and Body Language.....	109
Learning Objectives:.....	109
Introduction.....	109
Vocal Delivery Techniques.....	112
Nonverbal Communication	120
Using Notes and Scripts Effectively.....	127
Managing Presentation Anxiety	133
Evaluation.....	142
Summary.....	145
Chapter 5 Specialized Academic Presentations	148
Learning Objectives:.....	148
Introduction.....	148
Conference Paper Presentations.....	152
Poster Presentations	159
Thesis and Dissertation Defenses.....	165
Group Presentations and Collaboration.....	173
Evaluation.....	183
Summary.....	187
Chapter 6 Advanced Skills and Professional Development	190
Learning Objectives:.....	190
Introduction.....	190
Adapting to Different Disciplines	195
Virtual and Hybrid Presentations	203
Critical Evaluation of Presentations.....	214
Building Your Academic Presence.....	222
Evaluation.....	230
Summary.....	234

References 237
About the Author..... 243
Appendices 245

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Course Description:

English for Academic Presentation is a comprehensive course designed to equip students with the essential skills required to deliver effective, engaging, and scholarly presentations in academic contexts. This course covers foundational aspects of academic discourse including audience analysis, structural organization, and appropriate use of academic register, while learning to craft compelling openings, develop evidence-based arguments, and construct powerful conclusions that invite scholarly dialogue. Emphasis is placed on visual communication strategies grounded in cognitive psychology, delivery techniques that project confidence and credibility, and specialized presentation formats such as conference papers, poster presentations, thesis and dissertation defenses, and collaborative group presentations. Upon completion, students will possess the presentation skills and strategic awareness necessary to communicate complex research findings with clarity, engage diverse audiences effectively, respond to critical questions with scholarly confidence, and leverage presentations as vehicles for building academic presence and advancing their careers.

Chapter 1
Foundations of
Academic
Presentation

Learning Objectives:
After completing this chapter, the students will be able to:

	1. Identify the key characteristics and purposes of academic presentations 2. Analyze their audience and adapt their presentation accordingly 3. Organize a presentation using the standard three-part structure 4. Use appropriate signposting language and transitions 5. Apply academic register and formal language conventions 6. Integrate research and citations ethically into oral presentations.
Chapter 2 Developing Strong Openings and Closings	Learning Objectives: After completing this chapter, the students will be able to: 1. Recognize common types of attention-grabbing opening techniques used in academic presentations. 2. Describe the purpose and function of preview statements in academic presentations. 3. Formulate research questions that effectively guide audience understanding of presentation objectives. 4. Examine how scope and limitations statements frame audience expectations appropriately.

	5. Assess the effectiveness of conclusion strategies in achieving synthesis versus mere repetition. 6. Produce complete opening and closing segments adapted to specific presentation contexts (conference, defense, seminar).
Chapter 3 Visual Aids and Slide Design	Learning Objectives: After completing this chapter, the students will be able to: 1. Apply fundamental design principles to create presentation slides that enhance rather than impede audience comprehension. 2. Analyze complex data sets to select appropriate visualization formats (charts, graphs, tables) that accurately represent relationships and patterns. 3. Assess presentation slides for cognitive load, information density, and visual clarity. 4. Design comprehensive visual presentation materials that integrate text, data visualizations, images, and multimedia elements appropriately.
Chapter 4 Delivery Skills and Body Language	Learning Objectives After completing this chapter, students will be able to:

	1. Demonstrate effective vocal delivery techniques in practice presentations to enhance audience comprehension. 2. Identify effective and ineffective nonverbal behaviors (eye contact, gestures, posture) in recorded presentations and explain their impact on audience engagement and speaker credibility. 3. Differentiate between appropriate and inappropriate uses of notes, scripts, and memorization for various academic presentation contexts. 4. Assess personal presentation anxiety levels and evaluate the effectiveness of specific anxiety management techniques. 5. Design a personalized delivery improvement plan that integrates vocal techniques, nonverbal strategies, note-taking approaches, and anxiety management methods.
Chapter 5 Specialized Academic Presentations	Learning Objectives: After completing this chapter, students will be able to: 1. Analyze the distinctive conventions, time constraints, and audience expectations of different specialized presentation formats.

	2. Compare effective and ineffective examples of specialized presentations. 3. Evaluate poster designs using established criteria for visual communication, information hierarchy, and audience engagement. 4. Design a complete specialized presentation (conference paper, poster, defense, or group presentation) that effectively communicating research content. 5. Develop strategic response plans for anticipated questions and challenges specific to each presentation format.
Chapter 6 Advanced Skills and Professional Development	Learning Objectives: After completing this chapter, the students will be able to: 1. Adapt presentation content, structure, and delivery style to suit different disciplinary conventions. 2. Demonstrate effective use of virtual presentation platforms and engagement strategies. 3. Analyze presentation performances (own and others') using explicit evaluative criteria. 4. Compare disciplinary presentation conventions across fields to identify

	underlying epistemological and methodological difference. 5. Assess the effectiveness of different presentation strategies for achieving specific professional goals in various academic contexts. 6. Develop a personalized professional development plan for continuous presentation skill improvement.
--	--

CHAPTER 1

FOUNDATIONS OF ACADEMIC PRESENTATION

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

After completing this chapter, the students will be able to:

1. Identify the key characteristics and purposes of academic presentations
2. Analyze their audience and adapt their presentation accordingly
3. Organize a presentation using the standard three-part structure
4. Use appropriate signposting language and transitions
5. Apply academic register and formal language conventions
6. Integrate research and citations ethically into oral presentations.

INTRODUCTION

Academic presentations are a special type of scholarly communication. They do more than just share information; they encourage critical thinking, build knowledge, and create intellectual exchange within academic communities. Unlike casual conversations or business presentations that aim to persuade or entertain, academic presentations follow strict rules. They must use evidence-based arguments, systematic investigation, and clear explanations of research methods that reflect the core values of academic work (Reinhart, 2013).

These presentations play several important roles in academic life. First, they give researchers a platform to share new findings before

they are formally published. Second, they create chances for colleagues to provide feedback that can improve future research. Third, they help presenters build their reputation and connections within their field. Finally, they add to the ongoing discussions that advance academic knowledge. Whether you're presenting in a small classroom, a large conference hall, or defending your thesis, academic presentations come with unique challenges. You need to make your content clear without oversimplifying it. You must engage different types of listeners while keeping your work rigorous and scholarly. You also need to sound confident while staying honest about what your research can and cannot prove. Learning what makes academic presentations different from other types of speaking, and building the skills they require, is the foundation for all effective scholarly communication.

This chapter covers the basic principles that lead to successful academic presentations. We'll examine four connected areas that work together to make presentations effective. First, we'll explore what makes academic presentations unique by looking at their key features and purposes. We'll see how they differ from other types of communication and what audiences expect from scholarly talks. Second, we'll look at how to structure and organize presentations. You'll learn how the traditional three-part framework (introduction, body, and conclusion) helps your audience follow your ideas and think critically about your work. Third, we'll examine academic language and style, focusing on word choices that show you are part of the scholarly community while still being clear to different types of audiences. Finally, we'll discuss research and content preparation. This includes how to select and combine sources ethically and how to cite them properly while building strong arguments that move your field forward. By paying careful attention to these basic elements, this

chapter gives you the concepts and practical strategies you need to create presentations that meet academic standards, engage scholarly audiences, and contribute meaningfully to intellectual discussions. The knowledge and skills you develop here provide the foundation for later chapters, which will build on these basics to help you develop more advanced presentation abilities.

UNDERSTANDING ACADEMIC PRESENTATIONS

Academic presentations are a fundamental way scholars communicate. They serve as a primary vehicle for researchers, students, and academics to share knowledge, engage in intellectual discussions, and contribute to their fields. Unlike informal conversations or business presentations, academic presentations follow rigorous standards of evidence, critical analysis, and systematic inquiry (Reinhart, 2013). These presentations happen in various settings: classroom seminars, departmental meetings, thesis defenses, and international conferences. Each context requires presenters to handle complex communication demands while maintaining scholarly credibility. As Swales and Feak (2012) observe, the ability to effectively communicate research findings orally has become increasingly essential in today's academic culture. Knowledge sharing now extends beyond written publications to include dynamic, interactive exchanges among scholarly communities. Strong presentation skills are crucial because they directly influence academic success, professional advancement, and the broader impact of your research contributions.

Academic presentations have distinctive characteristics that come from their foundations in knowledge-building and their communicative purposes. These differ fundamentally from business or informal presentations. Academic presentations prioritize advancing

knowledge through evidence-based arguments, systematic analysis, and critical engagement with existing scholarship (Hyland, 2009). While business presentations typically aim to persuade stakeholders or propose solutions to organizational challenges, academic presentations focus on informing peers, testing hypotheses, defending theoretical positions, and inviting scholarly critique. This distinction shows up in several key features: explicit citation of sources, acknowledgment of research limitations, use of specialized disciplinary terms, and expectations of intellectual rigor in both content and delivery. Rowley-Jolivet and Carter-Thomas (2005) emphasize that academic presentations are inherently dialogic. They function not merely as one-way information transfers but as contributions to ongoing scholarly conversations that invite response, critique, and further development. The language used in these contexts reflects this scholarly orientation. It's characterized by formal register, precise terminology, and careful hedging that acknowledges the provisional nature of knowledge claims.

Understanding your audience is a critical part of effective academic presentation. Presenters must continually adjust their content, language, and delivery strategies to meet listeners' expectations and knowledge levels. Audience analysis in academic settings proves particularly complex because of potential differences in disciplinary backgrounds, expertise levels, and epistemological orientations among attendees. As Morita (2000) demonstrates through ethnographic research, graduate students must develop sophisticated awareness of audience expectations as they negotiate their positioning within disciplinary communities. A presentation delivered to specialists within your own subfield demands different rhetorical strategies than one addressed to an interdisciplinary audience or to faculty members evaluating a thesis defense. Biber's (2006) corpus-

based analysis of university language reveals systematic variations in register and discourse features across different academic contexts, underscoring the importance of rhetorical flexibility. Effective presenters assess multiple dimensions of their audience: disciplinary knowledge, familiarity with specific methodologies, expectations regarding evidence and argumentation, and even cultural conventions that may shape communicative norms in international contexts.

Academic presentations serve purposes that extend beyond simple information transmission. They encompass multiple interconnected functions that reflect the complex ecology of scholarly communication. Zareva (2013) identifies several primary objectives that academic presenters pursue: demonstrating mastery of subject matter, establishing credibility within a scholarly community, contributing original insights to existing knowledge, engaging critically with prior research, and inviting collegial dialogue. These purposes operate simultaneously and often in tension with one another, requiring presenters to balance competing demands. For instance, establishing your expertise requires demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of relevant literature. Yet the time constraints of most presentations demand strategic selection and synthesis rather than exhaustive review. Similarly, presenting original contributions requires differentiating your work from prior scholarship while simultaneously acknowledging intellectual debts and situating findings within established frameworks. Thompson (2002) notes that skilled academic presenters employ various narrative and rhetorical strategies to navigate these tensions. They craft presentations that simultaneously inform, persuade, and invite critical engagement while maintaining appropriate scholarly humility regarding the limitations and implications of their work.

The contemporary landscape of academic presentation continues to evolve in response to technological developments, changing institutional contexts, and shifting norms within scholarly communities. Traditional face-to-face conference presentations now coexist with virtual presentations, poster sessions, three-minute thesis competitions, and multimedia formats that challenge conventional presentation paradigms (Hyland & Shaw, 2016). These developments have expanded the repertoire of skills that academic presenters must master, including proficiency with presentation technologies, adaptation to diverse delivery formats, and navigation of increasingly interdisciplinary audiences. Despite these changes, the fundamental principles of effective academic presentation remain constant: clear articulation of research questions or arguments, systematic presentation of evidence, critical engagement with relevant scholarship, appropriate use of academic language and register, and ethical citation practices. As Swales (2004) argues in his analysis of research genres, academic presentations represent a distinctive genre with recognizable conventions and expectations. While subject to disciplinary variation and historical change, they maintain coherent identity as forms of scholarly communication. Understanding these conventions and expectations constitutes the essential foundation upon which all subsequent presentation skills must be built.

PRESENTATION STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION

The organizational framework of an academic presentation serves as the architectural foundation for effective scholarly communication. It provides both the presenter and the audience with a clear roadmap for navigating complex ideas and arguments. Research on academic discourse has consistently shown that well-structured presentations

make content easier to understand, improve retention, and help audiences engage more critically with what's being presented (Reinhart, 2013). The challenge facing academic presenters isn't just about having valuable insights or strong data. It's about organizing these elements into a coherent narrative that guides listeners through the logical progression of ideas. As Rowley-Jolivet and Carter-Thomas (2005) observe in their analysis of conference presentation rhetoric, structure functions as more than mere organizational scaffolding. It actively shapes how audiences perceive the validity and significance of research claims. The most compelling academic presentations demonstrate what Swales and Feak (2012) describe as "architectural clarity." This means a transparent organizational logic that allows audiences to anticipate, follow, and ultimately evaluate the presenter's arguments. This clarity becomes particularly crucial in academic contexts where audiences must not only comprehend information but also assess its methodological soundness, theoretical implications, and contribution to existing scholarship.

The conventional three-part structure (introduction, body, and conclusion) has endured as the predominant organizational framework for academic presentations precisely because it aligns with fundamental principles of human cognition and persuasive communication. This tripartite structure, rooted in classical rhetoric and reinforced by contemporary research on discourse processing, provides audiences with clear entry points, developmental trajectories, and closure points that facilitate both comprehension and critical evaluation (Lucas, 2014). The introduction establishes the communicative contract between presenter and audience, explaining what will be covered, why it matters, and how the presentation will unfold. The body delivers on this contract through systematic development of arguments, evidence, and analysis. The conclusion

synthesizes key insights and articulates their broader significance, providing audiences with interpretive frameworks for understanding the presentation's contribution. However, as Thompson (2002) cautions, this structure should not be applied mechanically. Rather, effective presenters adapt the basic framework to suit their specific content, disciplinary conventions, and audience expectations. The three-part structure works best when it remains flexible enough to accommodate the varied demands of different presentation types (whether reporting empirical research findings, defending theoretical positions, or synthesizing bodies of literature) while maintaining sufficient coherence to guide audience comprehension.

The introduction to an academic presentation carries disproportionate weight in determining the success of the entire communicative event. It establishes not only the content focus but also the presenter's credibility and the audience's willingness to engage. Effective introductions accomplish multiple simultaneous functions: capturing audience attention, establishing the relevance and significance of the topic, articulating clear objectives or research questions, and previewing the organizational structure of the presentation (Rowley-Jolivet, 2002). The opening moments prove particularly critical, as research on attention and engagement suggests that audiences form initial assessments of presenter credibility and content value within the first minute of a presentation. Hood and Forey (2005) demonstrate through discourse analysis of conference presentations that successful presenters employ various rhetorical strategies in their openings. These include establishing common ground with the audience, identifying gaps or problems in existing research, and positioning their own work as addressing these gaps. The preview statement, which explicitly outlines the structure and scope of the presentation, serves the crucial function of reducing

cognitive load for listeners. It provides them with an organizational framework for processing subsequent information. As Carter-Thomas and Rowley-Jolivet (2008) note, this explicit signposting reflects broader conventions in academic discourse that privilege clarity and transparency over suspense or surprise.

The body of an academic presentation demands careful organizational planning. Presenters must balance competing imperatives: comprehensiveness versus selectivity, depth versus breadth, and chronological versus thematic development. Swales (2004) identifies several common organizational patterns employed in academic presentations, each suited to different types of content and disciplinary traditions. Empirical research presentations often follow a problem-solution or question-answer structure, while theoretical arguments may employ compare-contrast or cause-effect patterns. Literature reviews frequently utilize chronological or thematic organization, though Dubois (1987) argues that thematic organization typically proves more effective for synthesizing diverse sources around central concepts. The challenge intensifies when presenters must condense extensive research into brief presentation formats, as commonly occurs at conferences where strict time limits apply. In such contexts, presenters must make strategic decisions about which elements to foreground, which to mention briefly, and which to omit entirely, while maintaining sufficient detail to allow audiences to evaluate the validity and significance of claims. Ventola et al. (2002) emphasize that the body's organization should reflect not merely the chronology of the research process but rather a logical argument structure that privileges the most significant findings and their theoretical or practical implications. This requires presenters to resist the temptation to exhaustively report all aspects of their work. Instead,

they should focus on strategic selection that serves the presentation's overarching objectives.

Signposting (the explicit articulation of organizational structure and transitions between ideas) constitutes an essential feature of effective academic presentation that distinguishes oral from written scholarly communication. While readers of academic texts can navigate structure through visual cues such as section headings, paragraph breaks, and textual layout, listeners in presentation contexts lack these navigational aids. They must rely instead on explicit verbal markers to track organizational progression (Reinhart, 2013). Biber (2006) demonstrates through corpus analysis that successful academic speakers employ signposting devices with considerably greater frequency than academic writers. They use phrases such as "first," "next," "turning now to," and "in conclusion" to guide audience comprehension. These transition markers serve multiple functions: they signal shifts between major sections or ideas, they indicate the logical relationships among concepts, and they provide audiences with brief moments to consolidate understanding before new information is introduced. Hyland (2005) conceptualizes signposting as an interactive feature of academic discourse that acknowledges the audience's presence and facilitates their engagement with the content. Effective signposting operates at multiple levels. Macro-level transitions connect major sections, while micro-level connections link individual points. This creates a hierarchical structure that helps audiences distinguish primary arguments from supporting details and understand how various elements contribute to the overall thesis or research narrative.

The conclusion of an academic presentation serves functions that extend beyond simple recapitulation. It offers instead an opportunity for synthesis, reflection, and forward-looking consideration of

implications and future directions. Webber (2005) distinguishes between mere summarization (which risks tedious repetition of previously stated points) and genuine synthesis, which reframes key insights in light of the presentation as a whole and articulates their broader significance. Effective conclusions remind audiences of the presentation's central thesis or research question, synthesize major findings or arguments, and explicitly address the "so what?" question that determines a presentation's ultimate value to scholarly discourse. In empirical research presentations, conclusions typically discuss implications for theory, methodology, or practice, acknowledge limitations that might qualify the findings, and suggest directions for future investigation. For theoretical or argumentative presentations, conclusions may highlight the stakes of the argument, address potential counterarguments, or explore ramifications for related scholarly conversations. Bamford (2005) notes that conclusions also serve an important interactive function by creating space for questions and discussion, with many presenters explicitly inviting audience engagement during this phase. The transition from presentation to question-and-answer session requires careful management. Presenters must shift from monologic delivery to dialogic exchange while maintaining scholarly authority and demonstrating openness to critique. This balance reflects broader academic values of intellectual rigor tempered by scholarly humility.

The achievement of coherence (the quality of "hanging together" as a unified whole) represents the ultimate measure of successful presentation organization. It transcends mere structural correctness to create a genuinely integrated communicative experience. Coherence emerges not simply from following organizational templates but from establishing clear logical relationships among ideas, maintaining consistent terminology and conceptual frameworks throughout the

presentation, and ensuring that each element contributes meaningfully to the overarching argument or narrative (Hyland, 2009). Flowerdew and Miller (1997) identify several linguistic and rhetorical strategies that enhance coherence: the use of cohesive devices such as pronoun reference and lexical repetition, the maintenance of consistent verb tense and voice, and the employment of parallel grammatical structures for related ideas. Coherence also depends on what Swales (2004) terms "cumulative reasoning." This is the progressive development of ideas such that each point builds upon and extends previous points rather than appearing as discrete, unrelated observations. For academic audiences, coherence proves particularly important because it enables critical evaluation. When presentations lack coherence, audiences struggle not only to comprehend the content but also to assess its validity, significance, and contribution to existing knowledge. Thus, attention to organizational structure and coherence represents not merely a stylistic preference but an ethical obligation to present one's work in ways that permit informed scholarly judgment and productive intellectual exchange.

ACADEMIC LANGUAGE AND REGISTER

Academic language and register are fundamental aspects of scholarly communication that distinguish academic presentations from other forms of oral discourse. They reflect not merely stylistic preferences but commitments to precision, objectivity, and intellectual rigor. Hyland (2009) defines academic register as a constellation of linguistic features (including vocabulary choices, grammatical structures, and rhetorical conventions) that signal membership in scholarly communities and adherence to disciplinary norms of knowledge construction and dissemination. The appropriate use of

academic register in presentations demonstrates the presenter's socialization into academic discourse practices and helps establish credibility among peer audiences. However, as Biber (2006) demonstrates through extensive corpus analysis, academic spoken language differs systematically from academic written language. Oral presentations require a balance between formal precision and conversational accessibility that proves challenging for many novice presenters. The register choices presenters make carry significant consequences. Overly informal language may undermine perceived expertise and scholarly authority, while excessively formal or jargon-laden language can obstruct comprehension and alienate audiences. Understanding and deploying appropriate academic register thus represents a crucial competency for effective academic presentation. It requires presenters to navigate tensions between accessibility and precision, formality and engagement, and disciplinary specificity and interdisciplinary comprehensibility.

The distinction between formal and informal language in academic presentations manifests across multiple linguistic dimensions, including lexical selection, grammatical complexity, and discourse organization. Each level contributes to the overall register effect. Formal academic language prioritizes precision and explicitness. It favors specific terminology over general vocabulary, complete grammatical constructions over elliptical forms, and explicit logical connectors over implicit relationships (Hyland, 2006). Table 1.1 illustrates common lexical contrasts between informal and formal academic expression, highlighting the systematic patterns that characterize appropriate register choices in scholarly contexts.

Table 1.1. Formal versus Informal Language in Academic Presentations

Informal Expression	Formal Academic Expression	Context of Use
lots of / a lot of	numerous / substantial / considerable	Quantification without specific numbers
get bigger / smaller	increase / decrease / expand / contract	Describing changes or trends
show / prove	demonstrate / indicate / suggest / reveal	Presenting evidence or findings
find out / figure out	determine / ascertain / establish / discover	Describing research processes
use / used	utilize / employ / implement / apply	Describing methodology or tools
thing / stuff	factor / element / aspect / component / variable	Referring to abstract concepts
good / bad	effective / beneficial / problematic / detrimental	Evaluating outcomes or approaches
sort of / kind of	somewhat / to some extent / relatively	Qualifying statements (often better to use precise hedging)
really / very	significantly / considerably / substantially	Emphasizing degree or importance
buy / sell	purchase / acquire / market / distribute	Economic or transactional contexts

Informal Expression	Formal Academic Expression	Context of Use
help / helped	facilitate / contribute to / support / enable	Describing causal relationships
think / believe	argue / contend / posit / propose / hypothesize	Presenting claims or positions

However, formality should not devolve into unnecessary complexity or obscurity. Jordan (1997) cautions against what he terms "academic pretension." This is the deployment of elaborate vocabulary or convoluted syntax that serves primarily to signal erudition rather than to enhance clarity or precision. Effective academic presenters select formal language that serves genuine communicative purposes: technical terminology when precision demands it, formal vocabulary when it carries specific disciplinary meanings, and simpler alternatives when they communicate more clearly. As Flowerdew and Peacock (2001) observe, the optimal register for academic presentations maintains formality in content and structure while incorporating elements of conversational style. These elements include direct address to the audience, rhetorical questions, and inclusive pronouns that sustain engagement and facilitate comprehension.

Hedging, or the use of cautious language to qualify claims and acknowledge uncertainty, represents a distinctive and essential feature of academic discourse. It reflects scholarly values of precision, intellectual honesty, and openness to alternative interpretations. Hyland (2005) conceptualizes hedging as both an epistemic strategy (indicating the presenter's degree of commitment to truth claims) and a politeness strategy that softens assertions and creates space for

disagreement or alternative viewpoints. Academic presentations employ hedging more extensively than many other discourse types because scholarly knowledge claims typically rest on limited evidence, specific methodological approaches, and particular theoretical frameworks. All of these introduce potential limitations and alternative interpretations. The strategic use of hedging demonstrates sophisticated understanding of epistemological nuance and disciplinary conventions while protecting presenters from overstatement that might invite justified criticism. Table 1.2 presents common hedging devices organized by grammatical category, illustrating the rich repertoire of linguistic resources available for expressing appropriate caution in academic claims.

Table 1.2. Hedging Devices in Academic Presentations

Hedging Type	Examples	Function and Usage
Modal Verbs	may, might, could, would, can	Express possibility or probability: "These results <i>may</i> indicate..." / "This approach <i>could</i> be effective..."
Probability Adverbs	probably, possibly, perhaps, likely, potentially, apparently	Qualify likelihood: "The data <i>probably</i> reflects..." / " <i>Possibly</i> due to sampling limitations..."
Approximators	approximately, roughly, about, around, nearly, almost	Indicate imprecise quantities: " <i>Approximately</i> 60% of participants..." / " <i>Nearly</i> all respondents..."

Hedging Type	Examples	Function and Usage
Epistemic Verbs	suggest, indicate, appear, seem, tend to, imply	Weaken causal or conclusive claims: "The findings <i>suggest</i> that..." / "This pattern <i>appears to</i> demonstrate..."
Epistemic Adjectives/Nouns	possible, probable, likely, apparent; possibility, probability, likelihood	Frame claims as contingent: "One <i>possible</i> explanation..." / "The <i>likelihood</i> of this outcome..."
Limiting Phrases	in most cases, generally, typically, to a certain extent, to some degree, under certain conditions	Restrict scope of claims: " <i>Generally speaking</i> , the model predicts..." / " <i>In most cases</i> , this approach works..."
Distance Markers	according to the data, based on these findings, the evidence suggests	Attribute claims to evidence: " <i>Based on these findings</i> , we can conclude..."
Admission of Limitations	although, while, despite, however, with the limitation that	Acknowledge constraints: " <i>While</i> these results are promising, sample size limits generalizability..."

REFERENCES

- Alley, M., Schreiber, M., Ramsdell, K., & Muffo, J. (2006). How the design of headlines in presentation slides affects audience retention. *Technical Communication*, 53(2), 225-234.
- American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000>
- Bamford, J. (2005). Interactivity in academic lectures: The role of questions and answers. In J. Bamford & M. Bondi (Eds.), *Dialogue within discourse communities* (pp. 123-145). Niemeyer.
- Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines* (2nd ed.). Open University Press.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. John Benjamins.
- Burgoon, J. K., Guerrero, L. K., & Floyd, K. (2016). *Nonverbal communication*. Routledge.
- Carter-Thomas, S., & Rowley-Jolivet, E. (2008). If-conditionals in medical discourse: From theory to disciplinary practice. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(3), 191-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.03.004>

- Cress, C. (2015). *The CRAAP test*. Meriam Library, California State University, Chico.
- Dubois, B. L. (1985). The construction of noun phrases in biomedical journal articles. In J. Benson & W. Greaves (Eds.), *Systemic perspectives on discourse* (Vol. 1, pp. 49-67). Ablex.
- Dubois, B. L. (1987). A reformulation of thematic progression typology. *Text & Talk*, 7(2), 89-116. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1987.7.2.89>
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2013). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Flowerdew, J., & Miller, L. (1997). The teaching of academic listening comprehension and the question of authenticity. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(1), 27-47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(96\)00030-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(96)00030-5)
- Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gregersen, T., & MacIntyre, P. D. (Eds.). (2017). *Innovative practices in language teacher education: Spanning the spectrum from intra- to inter-personal professional development*. Springer.
- Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2012). The use of videoconferencing to support multimodal interaction in an online language classroom. *ReCALL*, 24(2), 116-137. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095834401200002X>
- Hood, S., & Forey, G. (2005). Introducing a conference paper: Getting interpersonal with your audience. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(4), 291-306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.07.003>

- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132. <https://doi.org/10.2307/327317>
- Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(8), 1091-1112. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00035-8)
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse: English in a global context*. Continuum.
- Hyland, K., & Shaw, P. (Eds.). (2016). *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes*. Routledge.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- King, J. (2002). Preparing EFL learners for oral presentations. *Dong-A Journal of English Language and Literature*, 4, 401-418.
- Kosslyn, S. M. (2007). *Clear and to the point: 8 psychological principles for compelling PowerPoint presentations*. Oxford University Press.
- Lucas, S. E. (2014). *The art of public speaking* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Mayer, R. E. (2009). *Multimedia learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

- McCroskey, J. C. (2009). Communication apprehension: What have we learned in the last four decades. *Human Communication*, 12(2), 157-171.
- Morell, T. (2015). International conference paper presentations: A multimodal analysis to determine effectiveness. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 137-150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.10.002>
- Morita, N. (2000). Discourse socialization through oral classroom activities in a TESL graduate program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 279-310. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587953>
- Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of English for specific purposes*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Paulus, T. M., Warren, A., & Lester, J. N. (2016). Applying conversation analysis methods to online talk: A literature review. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 12, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.04.001>
- Reinhart, S. M. (2013). *Giving academic presentations* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Reynolds, G. (2011). *Presentation Zen: Simple ideas on presentation design and delivery* (2nd ed.). New Riders.
- Rowley-Jolivet, E. (2002). Visual discourse in scientific conference papers: A genre-based study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21(1), 19-40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(00\)00024-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00024-7)
- Rowley-Jolivet, E. (2004). Different visions, different visuals: A social semiotic analysis of field-specific visual composition in scientific conference presentations. *Visual Communication*, 3(2), 145-175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147035704043038>

- Rowley-Jolivet, E., & Carter-Thomas, S. (2005). Genre awareness and rhetorical appropriacy: Manipulation of information structure by NS and NNS scientists in the international conference setting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(1), 41-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.06.001>
- Rowley-Jolivet, E., & Carter-Thomas, S. (2005). The rhetoric of conference presentation introductions: Context, argument and interaction. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 45-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00080.x>
- Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2009). *Building genre knowledge*. Parlor Press.
- Thompson, P. (2002). Spoken language corpora. In K. Hyland (Ed.), *Teaching and researching writing* (pp. 59-74). Longman.
- Thompson, S. (2002). 'As the story unfolds': The uses of narrative in research presentations. In E. Ventola, C. Shalom, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *The language of conferencing* (pp. 147-167). Peter Lang.
- Tufte, E. R. (2006). *Beautiful evidence*. Graphics Press.
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2021). *Copyright law of the United States (Title 17)*. <https://www.copyright.gov/title17/>
- Ventola, E., Shalom, C., & Thompson, S. (Eds.). (2002). *The language of conferencing*. Peter Lang.

- Ventola, E., Shalom, C., & Thompson, S. (Eds.). (2002). *The language of conferencing*. Peter Lang.
- Webber, P. (2005). Interactive features in medical conference monologue. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24(2), 157-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.02.003>
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC Journal*, 37(3), 308-328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206071315>
- World Wide Web Consortium. (2018). *Web content accessibility guidelines (WCAG) 2.1*. <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/>
- Zareva, A. (2013). Self-mention and the projection of multiple identity roles in TESOL graduate student presentations: The case of thank you. *English for Specific Purposes*, 32(3), 167-178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2013.05.002>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Herminus Efrando Pabur, M.Pd is a lecturer at English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Arts, Universitas Negeri Manado. He earned his bachelor in 2014 and his magister degrees in 2019 majoring in English Education at Universitas Negeri Mando, Indonesia. His research interest is in the area of English Language Teaching and Learning, Assessment on ELT and Curriculum & Material Development.



Ismail, S.Pd., M.Hum. is a dedicated educator and researcher in the field of English language teaching based in Universitas Negeri Manado. He earned his bachelor's degree in 2013 from Universitas Negeri Makassar and later obtained his Master's degree in 2015 from Universitas Hasanuddin. Ismail's research interests revolve around the integration of technology in language teaching, seeking innovative ways to engage learners and improve their language acquisition process.



Sabrina Wardatul Jannah Husain, S.Pd, M.A., was born in Gorontalo. She is a lecturer of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Language and Art, Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia. In 2015, Sabrina completed her undergraduate studies at Gorontalo State University and a master's program at Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta in 2018.



Muhammad Ilham Ali, S.S., M.Pd is a lecturer in Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia. He earned his Magister degree in English Education from Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia and his Bachelor degree in English Literature from Hasanuddin University. His research interests are in the areas of Teaching English Literature and Self-access Language Learning.



Yuyu Anggraini H. Katili, M.Pd is a lecturer at Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia. She earned her Bachelor and Magister degree majoring in English Education from Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia. Her research interests are in the areas of English Language Teaching, Curriculum and Materials Development and Gender Studies.

ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PRESENTATION

You've spent months or even years conducting groundbreaking research, but when it's time to present your findings, you feel unprepared. Your heart races, your slides feel cluttered, and you worry whether your message will truly reach your audience. This is the reality for countless students and researchers who have mastered their subject matter but never received formal training in the art of academic presentation. *English for Academic Presentation* fills this critical gap, transforming presentation anxiety into confidence and unclear communication into powerful scholarly discourse.

This book guides you through every essential aspect of academic presentation: from structuring compelling openings that capture attention to designing visual aids that clarify rather than confuse, from mastering delivery techniques that engage audiences to navigating specialized formats like conference papers, poster sessions, and dissertation defenses. It doesn't matter who you are, a graduate student preparing for your first conference, an international scholar presenting in English, or an established researcher seeking to refine your skills, this book provides the frameworks, strategies, and practical examples you need to present your research with clarity, confidence, and impact. Your research deserves to be heard; this book ensures it will be.



IKAPI
IKATAN PUBLISER INDONESIA

CV. Tahta Media Group
Surakarta, Jawa Tengah
Web : www.tahtamedia.com
Ig : tahtamedia group
Telp/WA : +62 896-5427-3996

