British and Montenegrin university lecture introductions: A corpus-based study of their rhetorical structure

Branka Živković
University of Montenegro (Montenegro)
brankaz@ucg.ac.me

Abstract

This study explores the rhetorical structure of university lecture introductions and its linguistic specificities. Applying genre, corpus and contrastive analyses, it aims to identify which moves and steps are used in lecture introductions in English and Montenegrin, as well as to reveal differences and similarities in their structure between the two languages. Drawing upon the Swalesean move approach (1981, 1990) and referring to the models already established in the literature, the study examines academic lectures in the linguistics discipline taken from the electronically available British corpora, and a specially compiled corpus of Montenegrin linguistic lectures. The results show the major difference lying in a more elaborate framework in British lecture introductions. This consists of three moves – *Move 1: Orienting the students, Move 2: Setting-up lecture framework* and *Move 3: Putting topic in context*, compared to the two-move structure of Montenegrin lecture introductions composed of Move 2 and Move 3. Some specific differences are also noticed in the composition of these two moves. The main similarity lies in the presence of two obligatory moves in both corpora, Move 2 and Move 3 respectively, reflecting the influence of the lecture as an established academic genre in university settings regardless of the language in which lectures were delivered. In addition, compared to the established models in the literature, the findings have yielded three steps that are original to this study.

Keywords: university lecture introductions, linguistics lecture introductions, rhetorical structure, moves, steps.

Resumen

Introducción de las ponencias universitarias británicas y montenegrinas: un estudio de su estructura retórica basado en corpus

Este estudio explora la estructura retórica de las introducciones a las ponencias universitarias y sus especificidades lingüísticas. A partir de los análisis de género, de corpus y el análisis contrastivo, el presente artículo tiene como objetivo identificar qué movimientos (*moves*) y pasos se utilizan en las introducciones a las ponencias en inglés y montenegrino, así como revelar las diferencias y semejanzas en su estructura en los dos idiomas. Con base en el enfoque de movimientos de Swalesean (1981, 1990) y en los modelos ya establecidos en la bibliografía, el estudio examina varias ponencias universitarias sobre Lingüística procedentes de los corpus británicos ya disponibles y de un corpus que se ha compilado a partir de ponencias montenegrinas. Los resultados muestran que la mayor diferencia estriba en el hecho de que el marco de presentación de ponencias británico es más elaborado. Este incluye tres movimientos –movimiento 1: orientación de estudiantes; movimiento 2: configuración del marco de la ponencia; y movimiento 3: contextualización del tema–, en comparación con la estructura de ponencias montenegrinas, articulada a partir de dos movimientos: los movimientos 2 y 3. La principal semejanza es la presencia de dos movimientos obligatorios en ambos corpus (los movimientos 2 y 3), lo cual refleja la influencia de la ponencia como un género académico establecido en entornos universitarios y académicos, independientemente del idioma en el que las ponencias se imparten. Asimismo, en comparación con los modelos establecidos en la bibliografía, los resultados han evidencia la existencia de tres pasos originales para este estudio.

Palabras clave: introducciones a las ponencias universitarias, introducciones a las ponencias de Lingüística, estructura retórica, movimientos, pasos.

1. Introduction

Lecture introductions give information on the lecture topic, its structure, scope, aims and contextual framework. They introduce lectures which are normally sizeable monologue stretches, whose processing and comprehension represent a daunting task to non-native students who may experience "considerable difficulty in following academic lectures delivered in a foreign language" (Thompson, 1994, p. 172). To overcome such a difficulty, students need to become familiar with the structural framework of lecture introductions and their linguistic specificities, which may consequently enable the creation of "mental maps" helping students process

the information in the lectures (Thompson, 1994; Lee, 2009). More precisely, effective understanding of the introduction can assist students in making predictions about where the lecture is going, seeing where one component fits with another and within the whole lecture, and assessing the relative significance of each aspect of the lecture (Thompson, 1994, p. 176). Given that "the ability to predict presupposes an awareness of text structure" (Young, 1990, p. 212) and that this awareness leads to better comprehension, knowledge of the rhetorical organisation of lecture introductions is likely to be helpful when it comes to following and understanding the rest of the lecture.

Four genre-based studies on the rhetorical structure of lecture introductions have been conducted to date: Thompson (1994), Lee (2009), Shamsudin and Ebrahimi (2012) and Yaakob (2013). What they have in common is the employment of the Swalesean move approach (1981, 1990), which enabled them to determine specific structural components in the lecture introductions analysed, with some differences that will be discussed in Section 2.1. Three authors (Thompson, 1994; Lee, 2009; Yaakob, 2013), explored corpora of lecture introductions in different disciplines and broad scientific fields, whereas only Shamsudin and Ebrahimi (2012) investigated a discipline-specific corpus, that of engineering. All four studies are English-centered, meaning that none is contrastive in terms of examining the corpora of lecture introductions delivered in English and other languages. With this in mind, the present cross-linguistic research examines the rhetorical structure of lecture introductions given in English and Montenegrin in the linguistics discipline with the aim to identify similarities and differences between the two corpora. This will help us to determine whether the language and setting affect the rhetorical organisation of this very significant academic subgenre.

This study is contrastive and draws on electronically available British corpora and a specially collected corpus of Montenegrin linguistic lectures. The choice of languages was motivated by the following reasons. English is undoubtedly the recognised world language of both spoken and written academic communication. Thus, lectures, "as the most extended spoken genre in Higher Education institutions" (Bellés-Fortuño, 2018, p. 170), are held in English not only in English-speaking countries, but also in those where English is not a national language, such as Montenegro. Each year a number of students of English as a foreign language enroll at the University of Montenegro. These students have an opportunity to listen to the lectures

of English native and non-native speakers who, thanks to various scholarships and mobility programmes, come and teach for up to one academic year at the English Language and Literature Department. Moreover, different exchange and mobility programmes enable the students to study at international universities and attend lectures in English. In addition, Montenegrin university education in general aims to become more international by currently introducing study programmes for international students to be instructed in English. Having the internationalisation of university lecturing and learning in mind, it seems significant both for lecturers and students to become familiar with certain characteristics of the lecture genre. The former can become more attentive to their own lecture discourse in university settings and the latter should be able to follow and comprehend the lecture content more easily.

2. Theoretical background

While there is a number of ways of studying texts, genre analysis has become established as the most widely used and productive method of text analysis (Hyland, 2013, p. 98). One of the most salient directions within genre analysis is the groundbreaking Swalesean move approach (1981, 1990) which this research draws upon. It enables the identification of formal and linguistic features of various genre types. A genre is "a distinctive category of discourse of any type, spoken or written" (Swales, 1990, p. 33), with its communicative purpose understood by the genre community (Bhatia, 1993). The Swalesean framework aims to segment texts into units fulfilling a specific communicative purpose connected and contributing to the overall communicative objective of the genre. These units are known as moves and steps. A move represents a text component of a higher rank which is a "defined and bounded communicative act" (Lorés-Sanz, 2004, p. 282). Moves are composed of steps as their lower structural realisations directed to the communicative purpose of both moves and the whole genre.

From the Swalesean genre analysis perspective, a lecture can be defined as the main genre in tertiary education "for a lecturer to impart knowledge to students about a particular subject and for students to obtain knowledge about a subject by listening to the lecturer" (Yaakob, 2013, p. 46). In those normally long stretches of talk, students are faced with the demanding task of listening to, following and processing their content (Thompson, 1994;

Thompson, 2003; Lee, 2009). Lecture introductions, as a subgenre of the lecture genre, introduce lectures, providing information on the lecture topic, its scope, structure, aims, as well as its context. They "offer an opportunity for the lecturer to establish an interpretive framework for the audience to use as they listen to the rest of the lecture" (Thompson, 1994, pp. 145-146). Given that producing a structured sequence of utterances can assist listeners in creating a coherent mental representation of a talk (Brown & Yule, 1983, p. 17), it is necessary that lecturers structure their lecture introductions in such a way as to enable students to create "mental maps" (Thompson, 1994; Lee, 2009) that aid them in following and comprehending the rest of the lecture.

2.1. Previous genre studies on the structure of lecture introductions

The rhetorical organisation of lecture introductions has received only occasional scholarly attention. Four genre analyses of lecture introductions have been conducted to date: Thompson (1994), Lee (2009), Shamsudin and Ebrahimi (2012) and Yaakob (2013). In addition, previous research on the structure of lectures and lecture introductions encompasses two widely influential analyses carried out by Young (1994) and Palmer Silveira (2004).

Thompson (1994) was the first to analyse the structure of lecture introductions in a mixed corpus of 18 lecture introductions in applied linguistics, engineering and medicine. Using the Swalesean framework, Thompson introduced the terms *functions* and *subfunction*s. Not making a difference between a generic model in the mentioned disciplines, Thompson identified a general model composed of two main rhetorical functions: *setting up the lecture framework* and *putting topic in context,* with their specific subfunctions. *Setting up the lecture framework* "is essentially metalinguistic, in that it gives the audience information about the lecture discourse itself" (Thompson, 1994, p. 176). It consists of four subfunctions: *announce the topic*, *indicate scope*, *outline the structure* and *present aims*. On the other hand, *putting topic in context* is the function concerned with the lecture content realised through three subfunctions: *show importance/relevance of topic*, *relate 'new' to 'given'* and *refer to earlier lectures*.

Lee (2009) investigated how the class size influenced the rhetorical organisation of 10 lecture introductions from various disciplines taken from the MICASE. Following Thompson (1994), Lee (2009, p. 46) introduced another move, namely *warming up*, in which lecturers "warm up the audience

prior to the actual lecture, offering them general course information and course-related asides (or digressions), looking ahead to future lectures, and/or telling an anecdote". Lee (2009, p. 53) reported that the class size affected the choice of moves and steps in the examined lecture introductions, and recognised the limitation of his study observed in the small corpus used.

Based on Thompson's (1994) and Lee's (2009) models, Shamsudin and Ebrahimi's (2012) study examined a Malaysian Engineering Spoken English Corpus (MESEC) composed of only 6 lecture introductions in the field of engineering. They concluded that the Malaysian lecturers used the same three moves given in Lee's study (2009), and found some differences at the level of certain steps. Shamsudin and Ebrahimi added two steps, namely *greeting* and *reciting prayers*, to Lee's *warming up* move (2009). These steps seem specific to Malaysian engineering lecture introductions and signify "a more relaxed and rather sincere climate in the class which is more typical and preferred in Eastern countries" (Shamsudin and Ebrahimi, 2012, p. 1306).

Yaakob (2013) investigated a corpus of lecture introductions in four broad fields of arts and humanities, social, physical and life science taken from the British Academic Spoken English corpus (BASE). Following Dubois (1980), Yaakob (2013) introduced two main orientations, namely *content orientation* and *listener orientation*. The content orientation realises Thompson's two functions (1994): *setting up the lecture framework* and *putting topic in context*. The listener orientation, including seven subfunctions: *greeting, announcement, introduce oneself, check comprehension, check comprehension feedback, refer to handout* and *refer to visuals*, was recognised and added by Yaakob (2013).

Two of the salient studies about the structure of lectures and lecture introductions were performed by Young (1990, 1994) and Palmer Silveira (2004). Analysing the macro- and micro-structure of seven lectures in sociology, economy, engineering and geology, Young (1990, 1994) identified an analytical unit *phase* indicating a 'strand of discourse that recurs discontinuously throughout a particular language event' (1994, p. 165). Young revealed that the lecture macrostructure was composed of six phases divided into two groups: metadiscoursal and those pointing to the lecture content. The former consists of a *discourse structuring, conclusion* and *evaluation phase*, while the latter includes the *interaction phase, theory or content* and *example phase*. Although Young proposed a new schema for the lecture macrostructure, she did not conduct a quantitative analysis of the discoursal

units, which appears to be a very significant foundation for a subsequent qualitative analysis.

Palmer Silveira (2004) analysed the ways lecturers developed the initial part of their lectures in business, law and sociology. Paying attention to different linguistic devices, he investigated how the message of the current lecture was connected to the information already explained in previous lectures or to the documents/data students had, how the main topic was introduced and how the general layout was established. Palmer Silveira (2004) qualitatively presented different strategies that teaching professionals used in order to introduce their lectures by means of specific linguistic devices. He concluded that there was the need to start preparing professionals who could deliver lectures to their prospective students as successfully as possible (Palmer Silveira, 2004, p. 112).

2.2. The current study

These earlier studies reveal a great deal about the complexities of the rhetorical organisation of lecture introductions. However, they did not examine the impact of the language itself (and its associations) on the rhetorical structure. No efforts so far have been made to explore a discipline-specific corpus of lecture introductions delivered in two different languages. The abovementioned studies focused mainly on the exploration of a mixed corpus of English lecture introductions in different disciplines or broad scientific fields, apart from that of Shamsudin and Ebrahimi (2012) which investigated a corpus of engineering English lecture introductions. None of the authors analysed lecture introductions in the specific field of linguistics. As for the Montenegrin and the BCMS (Bosnian/Croatian/Montenegrin/Serbian) context in general, research on lecture introductions' rhetorical organisation has not been conducted until now. Against this background, the present study explores lecture introductions in the linguistics discipline. Lectures on linguistics were also chosen as it is the discipline with which the author is the most familiar and from which the author was in a position to collect the corpus for Montenegrin lectures. Unlike previous studies, this paper examines British and Montenegrin lecture introductions and deals with the following research questions:

RQ1. Which moves and steps are used in British lecture introductions in linguistics?

RQ2. Which moves and steps are used in Montenegrin lecture introductions in linguistics?

RQ3. Are there differences and similarities in lecture introductions between the two corpora?

To answer these questions, the standard British corpora and a specially collected corpus of Montenegrin lectures are explored, with the aim of determining a discipline-specific rhetorical model of lecture introductions in two different languages, and identifying whether the language and setting affect their rhetorical organisation. The cross-linguistic perspective of the present study may add to contrastive linguistics and to the existing body of knowledge on the contrastive investigations of academic lectures. Due to the internationalisation of university lecturing mainly through mobility programmes and the rapid expansion of EMI teaching contexts, these findings may be relevant to both native and non-native lecturers and students. Lecturers could gain insights into how British and Montenegrin professors of linguistics structure their lecture introductions and which linguistic resources they use in their structural components. There is also a possibility of applying the current study results in designing syllabi for EMI teacher training courses. As EMI lecturers are not language experts, they need to be trained to be more attentive to their own lecture discourse. They could become more aware of the rhetorical structure of lecture introductions, which may be useful when teaching students from various linguistic backgrounds. On the other hand, the findings are of relevance to students who can become knowledgeable about the structural and linguistic features of lecture introductions, and, in that way, overcome difficulties in listening to and following the rest of the lecture content.

3. Data and analysis

This study focuses on 24 university lectures in linguistics, or a total of 181,008 words. The lectures are divided into two corpora – the British and the Montenegrin. The British corpus consists of 12 university lectures, i.e. 94,242 words, on a variety of topics in the field of linguistics. Seven lectures were drawn from the BASE[2] corpus, one lecture from the British National Corpus (BNC)[3] and four lectures from the University of Reading and its SACLL (Self-Access Centre for Language Learning). The Montenegrin corpus includes the same number of academic lectures (n=12), or 86,766

words, in the same discipline. It was specially collected as an electronic official corpus of the Montenegrin academic spoken language does not exist. The lectures[4] held by different assistant, associate, and full professors of linguistics, at undergraduate and graduate levels, were audio recorded. The audio files were then transcribed by means of the common transcription symbols used in discourse analysis (given in Appendix 2). The details on the corpora are included in Appendix 1.

The British and Montenegrin corpora share the following features a) they are composed of the same number of university lectures belonging to the particular subject field of linguistics, b) they cover various topics within this discipline, c) they were given by university lecturers in the university context, d) lecturers are native speakers of British English and Montenegrin.

The lecture introductions were separated from the lecture central parts by means of a) careful reading of transcripts and reference to their audio files[5], b) the presence of boundary markers, such as *ok*, *now*, *right*, *right so* in English, or their Montenegrin equivalents *dobro*, *sad*, *e sad*, *dobro dakle*, as well as the combination of discourse markers and filled pauses, such as *erm now*, *er okay* (Thompson, 1994; Sinclair and Culthard, 1975), c) semantic criteria, meaning that introductions were considered to have ended once the lecturer set up the lecture framework and provided some contextualisation, and d) reference to the already established models in the literature (Thompson, 1994; Lee, 2009; Shamsudin and Ebrahimi, 2012; Yaakob, 2013).

In addition, there were lectures with no boundary markers in the introductory section. In such cases, the boundary between the lecture introductions and the main body was drawn on the basis of the careful reading of the transcripts and "identifying the point where the lecturers moved into the substantive part of the lecture" (Lee, 2009, p. 46), i.e. the mentioned semantic criteria were applied.

The Swalesean move analysis framework (1990) was employed in examining the structure of lecture introductions, and the existing abovementioned studies were considered. The method of contrastive analysis was also applied to reveal differences and similarities between the corpora. To avoid the problem of researcher bias, a second rater[6] coded the structural units of lecture introductions. The results were compared with the author's and the cases with different codes were read again, discussed and resolved.

4. Results

The analysis of the British and Montenegrin corpora resulted in the following move structure (Table 1):

MOVES AND STEPS	Frequency			
	N of occurrences		%	
	British	Montenegrin	British	Montenegrin
MOVE 1: ORIENTING THE STUDENTS	**3**	**-**	**25**	**-**
Step 1: Greeting the students	2	-	16.6	-
Step 2: Thanking the students	1	-	8.3	-
MOVE 2: SETTING-UP LECTURE FRAMEWORK	**12**	**12**	**100**	**100**
Step 1: Announcing the topic	9	10	75	83.3
Step 2: Outlining the structure	8	4	66.6	33.3
Step 3: Indicating the scope	4	-	33.3	-
Step 4: Presenting aims	2	1	16.6	8.3
MOVE 3: PUTTING TOPIC IN CONTEXT	**11**	**10**	**91.6**	**83.3**
Step 1: Showing the importance/relevance of topic	6	1	50	8.3
Step 2: Relating "new" to "given"	5	4	41.6	33.3
Step 3: Referring to earlier lecture(s)	4	7	33.3	58.3
Step 4: Referring to future lecture(s)	1	-	8.3	-
Step 5: Referring to the course	3	4	25	33.3
Step 6: Referring to the exam	-	2	-	16.6
Step 7: Referring to other course(s)	-	2	-	16.6

Table 1. Moves and steps in British and Montenegrin lecture introductions.

Table 1 shows certain similarities and differences in the structure of university lecture introductions between the British and Montenegrin corpora. The main similarity exists in the presence of two obligatory moves *Move 2: Setting-up lecture framework* and *Move 3: Putting topic in context*, which record a very high frequency in both corpora. Move 2 appears in all the British and Montenegrin linguistic lectures (100%), and Move 3 displays a little higher frequency in the British corpus (91.6% and 83.3% respectively).

This major similarity reflects the influence of the lecture "as an established academic genre in tertiary education" (Chang, 2012, p. 113) regardless of the language the lectures were delivered in. The presence of two obligatory moves confirms the previous research on lecture introductions done by Thompson (1994), Lee (2009), Shamsudin and Ebrahimi (2012), Yaakob (2013).

The major difference lies in the more elaborate structure of the British lecture introduction. It is composed of three moves. Apart from Move 2 and Move 3, which are common to both British and Montenegrin corpora, *Move 1: Orienting the students* is found exclusively in British lectures. The next difference refers to a more complex internal structure of Move 2 in the British corpus and Move 3 in the Montenegrin. The internal composition of Move 2 includes four steps in the linguistic lectures in English, and one step fewer in the Montenegrin ones. Move 3 consists of five steps in the British lectures, while in the Montenegrin lectures it is realised through six steps. These differences will be discussed in more detail in the following subsections.

4.1. Move 1: orienting the students

Orienting the students includes two steps *greeting the students* and *thanking the students*. It is found in a quarter of the British corpus, whereas Montenegrin lecture introductions do not have this move. Its more frequent step *greeting the students* is signalled by the use of fixed greeting phrases, and can be "an indicator a speech act is beginning and that all students should start paying attention to what the lecturer says" (Yaakob, 2013, pp. 11-12), such as in the following examples:

(1) **Good morning** everybody, **good morning** teachers. (EL_{10})

(2) **Good morning** everybody (EL_{11})

A greeting is also found to be rare by Yaakob (2013, p. 116) as a consequence of "the unequal status between participants and social distance between lecturers and students".

Step 2: Thanking the students for attendance is present in just one lecture, and it may be for the reason that the last lecture a professor had was twenty years ago (Extract 3). It is a short step marked by the performative verb *to thank*:

(3) **Thanks very much**. Well, as I was saying when I was last lecturing in this lecture theatre twenty years ago, the.... (EL$_9$)

The absence of Move 1 in the Montenegrin lecture introductions could be explained in terms of the greater social distance between lecturers and students that possibly exists in this cultural context. However, future research on larger corpora of lecture introductions is needed to confirm this assumption.

4.2. Move 2: setting-up lecture framework

In contrast to the optional status of Move 1, *Move 2: Setting-up lecture framework* is obligatory in both corpora (100%). Professors here establish the lecture framework and give information about its topic, scope, structure and aims (Thompson, 1994, p. 176). In British linguistic lectures, Move 2 consists of four steps, *announcing the topic*, *outlining the structure*, *indicating the scope* and *presenting aims*. This result supports the previous studies and suggests the same structuredness of this move in the linguistics discipline. As for Montenegrin, the step *indicating the scope* is not identified.

Announcing the topic is the most common step both in British and Montenegrin linguistic lectures (75% and 83.3% respectively). Lecturers introduce the topic of their lectures, as in the following:

(4) And **today I am going to talk** about English. (EL$_{10}$)

(5) *Dobro, **današnje predavanje** su odredbe i dopune glagolskih riječi.* (ML$_1$)

    'Ok, **today's lecture** is modifiers and complements of verbs.'

(6) *Znači, **danas radimo** duge akcente naporedo sa svim ovim ostalim.* (ML$_{11}$)

    So, **today we are covering** long accents together with everything else.'

In Examples 4, 5 and 6, boundary markers *and*, *ok* and *so* mark the beginning of the lecture introductions. The announcement of the topic is typically expressed via the communicative verb *to talk* and the activity verb *to cover*, the adverb *today*, the noun phrase *današnje predavanje* 'today's lecture' and the first person pronouns *I/we*.

Outlining the structure is the step considered very important in the British corpus (66.6%), whereas it is found optional in the Montenegrin (33.3%). In this step lecturers inform students of what they will cover at certain points of the lecture:

(7) Er I thought I would **show** this week some ways in which that had been put into use as a means of research by students… **and then** I thought…I'd **show** you er I'd **move on to show** you some research…(EL$_7$)

(8) *Ali prije nego što **dođemo** do lekseme, mi ćemo **prvo reći** šta je riječ i koja je razlika između riječi i lekseme (zp) ovdje vrlo važno…tako da **ćemo** mo **prvo poći**, dakle, **od** definicije riječi.* (ML$_2$)

'But **before** we **come to** a lexeme, we will **first** say what a word is and what the difference between the word and the lexeme is (zp) very important here…therefore, we will **start with** the definition of a word.'

This step contains aspectual verbs which "characterize the stage of progress of some other event or activity" (Biber et al., 1999, p. 361). Lecturers state that they will *start with*, *move on* or *come to* specific issues during their lectures. Temporal expressions *and then* and *before* are also the markers of this step, as well as the adverb *first*, the activity verb *to show* and the communicative verb *to say*.

Indicating the scope is found only in British lecture introductions (33.3%). British professors give the information on how much time they will devote to particular aspects of their lectures to attract and keep the students' attention during the remainder of the lecture. Let us consider Excerpts 9 and 10.

(9) Right er okay well I'll start because er I'm going to have **to go very quick** today…(EL$_8$)

(10) So what I am going to give you this morning is a **quick**, **not too detailed**, but a look at the history of writing from its beginnings as we know it, until modern times. But **we've only got 50 minutes**, and for each stage in its history you could spend days on it, OK. (EL$_{12}$)

As we can see from Extracts 9 and 10, this step is frequently intertwined with the step *outlining the structure* and *announcing the topic*. Lecturers use the adjectives phrase *a quick*, *not too detailed*, the adverb phrase *very quick* and the construction *we've only got 50 minutes*. Such expressions indicate brevity thus suggesting students that professors will not cover too much of the subject matter. They are employed to draw and keep students' attention during the rest of the lecture.

Presenting aims is an optional step in both corpora (16.6% in British and 8.3% in Montenegrin respectively). In this step, British professors state the aim of their lectures using its most typical signals – the nouns *aim* or *reason* (Extract 11). In Extract 12, a Montenegrin lecturer employs the cognitive verb *to think* whose meaning is, in fact, *to plan/to intend* denoting what the professor's aim was.

(11) Now the **reason** that we have this session is actually because a few years ago…(EL$_2$)

(12) *Aha, dobro, onda ću morati ja sve da vam pričam, a ja sam **mislila** da to bude više razgovor. Da mi vi kažete šta tamo nijeste razumjeli, šta vam je bilo <komplikovano> (.) i slično.* (ML$_5$)

'Ok, then, I'll have to talk about everything, but I **thought** it would be more of a dialogue. To tell me what you haven't understood there, what has been <complicated> to you (.) and so on.'

4.3. Move 3: putting topic in context

Putting topic in context is another obligatory move identified in the structure of both British and Montenegrin lecture introductions (91.6% and 83.3% respectively). "While Setting up Lecture Framework orients the lecture-as-object towards the audience, Putting Topic in Context deals with the lecture-as-content" (Thompson, 1994, p. 178). This move contains the steps *showing importance/relevance of topic*, *relating "new" to "given"*, *referring to earlier lecture(s)*, *referring to future lecture(s)*, *referring to the course*, *referring to the exam* and *referring to other course(s)*. Montenegrin lecture introductions have all of them except *referring to future lecture(s)*. In contrast, the British corpus has two steps fewer, namely, *referring to the exam* and *referring to other course(s)*.

As for the previous research, the *putting topic in context* move is an essential structural component in the studies conducted by Thompson (1994), Lee (2009), Shamsudin and Ebrahimi (2012), Yaakob (2013). The difference between the current study and the earlier ones refers to three new steps added to the move in the present study: *referring to the course*, *referring to the exam* and *referring to other course(s)*.

Showing the importance/relevance of topic is present in the half of the British lecture introductions, while it is found only in one Montenegrin lecture. Examples 13, 14 and 15 serve as an illustration of this step.

(13) er today this perhaps will be [0.2] a few tips [0.6] perhaps pitched somewhere between er [0.6] a pep talk and a little bit of the reading of the riot act [0.5] but it's just to give you [0.2] a sense a kind of bit of fine tuning [0.3] for how you might [0.2] think about the work [0.2] that you present [0.2] for us to read [0.5] er [0.4] for the degree [0.6] pec-, er particularly as opposed to what you might have been doing [0.3] for A-level there are sort of **significant** shifts you see [0.4] so it's **no bad thing** early on to start thinking about the way things might change [0.4] (EL$_4$)

(14) er i'd move on to show you [0.2] some research which went beyond that and looked at [0.4] er vocabulary knowledge [0.2] **more extensively** because [0.2] of course there's more to knowing a word than just being able to recognize it on the page (EL7)

(15) *ali prije nego što dođemo do lekseme mi ćemo prvo reći šta je riječ i koja je razlika između riječi i lekseme (zp) ovdje **vrlo važno*** (ML2)

'but before we come to a lexeme we will first say what a word is and what a difference between the word and the lexeme is (zp) here **very important**'

Extracts 13 and 14 contain the evaluative adjective *significant*, the noun phrase *no bad thing*, and the adverb phrase *more extensively,* all pointing to the importance of the topics lecturers previously announced. This step is similarly expressed in Example 15, via the use of the evaluative adjective 'važno' *important* and its intensifier 'vrlo' *very*. It also follows the announcement of the topic.

In the step *relating "new" to "given"*, professors remind students of the information they already know so as to relate it to new points to be covered in the lecture. It has an optional status in both corpora (41.6% in British and 33.3% in Montenegrin). Let us look at Excerpts 16 and 17.

(16) So point one a **reminder** something that I keep saying, knowledge of language is knowledge of a bod a body of rules that assign phonological, syntactic and semantic properties to words and sentences. (EL6)

(17) *Dakle, danas ćemo govoriti o <semantici>. **Vi znate** da je semantika nauka o <značenju>, **vi znate** da je značenje od (.) prvih interesovanja za jezik i jezičke pojave. Takođe postojalo je interesovanje za tumačenje značenja, **vi** se (.) **sjećate** kad ste polagali u drugom semestru o (.) teoriji imenovanja.* (ML4)

'So, today we will be talking about <semantics>. **You know** that semantics is the science about <meaning>, **you know** that the meaning is one (.) of the first interest in a language and language phenomena. There was also interest into the interpretation of meaning, and **you** (.) **remember** when you had a test on a (.) theory of naming in the second semester.'

In Extract 16 a British lecturer uses the noun *reminder* to connect what students already know to a new lecture topic. In a similar way, his/her Montenegrin colleague employs the constructions *you know* or *you remember* to contextualise the topic s/he already announced in the first utterance (Extract 17).

Referring to earlier lecture(s) features near two times greater frequency in the Montenegrin corpus compared to the British (58.3% and 33.3% respectively). This finding suggests that Montenegrin lecturers find it more important to revise what was done in the earlier lecture(s), and connect it with the current one. Examples 18 and 19 serve as an illustration.

(18) I thought what I'd do today having **introduced** to you **last week** the idea of er measuring vocabulary (EL7)

(19) *Što se tiče instrumentala, još na **prošlom času** smo **rekli** da je to padež zajednice i da imamo dvije osnovne vrste instrumentala: instrumental oruđnik i instrumental socijativ. U instrumentalu oruđniku, **rekli smo to na prošlom času**, stoji ime pojma pomoću kog se vrši radnja i takav instrumental upotrebljava se isključivo bez predloga. Što se tiče instrumentala sa predlozima, **rekli smo i to**, slaže se sa malim brojem predloga i tu je, prije svega, predlog s, odnosno sa, koji obilježava društvo, pa se takav instrumental zove socijativ.* (ML3)

'As for the instrumental case, even at the **last lecture we said** that it is the case of company and that we have two basic kinds of the instrumental: instrumental indicating an instrument and comitative instrumental. In the instrumental indicating an instrument, **we said that at the last lecture**, there is the name of an entity by means of which the action is performed and such instrumental is used exclusively without prepositions. As for the instrumental with prepositions, **we said that also**, it is used with a small number of prepositions and that is, first of all, the preposition *s*, i.e. *sa[7]*, denoting company, so such instrumental is called a comitative one.'

Examples 18 and 19 illustrate referring to the last lecture typically marked by the noun phrases *last week* or *last lecture*, the verbs *to introduce*, *to say*, pointing to what was done at the previous lecture. These metadiscursive elements have the reviewing function of pointing backward in the discourse (Ädel, 2010, p. 86). By recalling the content covered in the earlier lecture(s), professors provide a contextual framework for the current one.

Referring to future lecture(s) is found only in Yaakob (2013), and the current study confirms that it can be a part of the British linguistic lecture introductions. *Referring to future lecture(s)* is an optional step, identified only in one British lecture, pointing to it being very rare:

(20) So the title of my lecture today is 'Heinz 57- the history of English and the rise of English as a global language'... so the end of my lecture will lead on to what John Slaght is going to talk to you about **next time**. So there will be a link (EL11)

In Example 20, a lecturer refers to a future lecture to be held by another professor on the same course. S/he connects the topic of the current lecture with the future one. Temporal expression *next time* is used, as well as the construction *be going to + infinitive*, pointing to the future lecture. Such linguistic elements reflect the previewing function of pointing forward in the discourse and announcing what is to come (Ädel, 2010, p. 86).

Referring to the exam is not identified in the previous studies. This study reveals the incidence of this optional step only in the Montenegrin corpus (16.6%). It relates the current lecture to the future exam so as to motivate students to study more intensively:

(21) *Onda **će vam poslužiti** (.) kao nešto što ćete moći da **koristite** dok budete spremali **ispit**, dok budete tražili definicije jezičke politike, odnos jezičke politike, jezičkog planiranja i standardizacije, dakle, imate sve u tom radu. Tako kad budete spremali se za **ispit**, imaćete tu osnovne, osnovne stvari o ovim sociolingvističkim pojmovima.* (ML5)

'Then it **will serve** (.) something you will be able **to use** when you study for the **exam**, while searching for the definitions of language policy, the relation between language policy, language planning and standardisation, therefore, you have everything in that article. So, when you prepare for the **exam**, you will have the basic things about these sociolinguistic notions.'

(22) *Proučite program. Pitaću vas sve vezano oko toga. Znači, štagod vas budem pitala (.) na **ispitu**, povezaću s programom* (ML8)

'Study the programme. **I will ask you everything about it**. So, whatever I **ask** you (.) **in the exam**, I will connect with the programme.'

This step is implicitly related to the step *showing the importance/relevance of topic*, as it suggests the significance of the current lecture topic for the future exam. Therefore, it is expressed through the noun *exam*, and the verbs *use*, *serve* and *ask*, or even the statement *I'll ask you everything about it*, implying the relevance of the topic.

Same as *referring to the exam*, the step *referring to the course* is not recognised by the previous studies. It displays a little higher frequency in the Montenegrin lectures than in the British (33.3% and 25%). Let us have a look at Excerpts 23 and 24.

(23) okay so this is **the first** [0.2] of [0.9] a few lect-, few lectures er [0.4] eight lectures [0.4] on [0.5] **historical linguistics or language change** (EL5)

(24) *U okviru **sintakse padeža ostalo nam je još da uradimo** instrumentalne sintagme sa predlozima i lokativne sintagme takođe sa predlozima.* (ML$_3$)

'Within the **syntax of cases**, **we are left with covering** the instrumental phrases with prepositions and locative phrases also with prepositions.'

In this step, British and Montenegrin lecturers put the topic in the context of the entire course. They announce the number of a lecture, *the first* in 23, or use the construction *ostalo nam je još da uradimo* 'we are left with covering' in 24, denoting the last lecture. Professors also refer to the specific name of courses.

Referring to other course(s) is a step that was not identified in the previous research. Although optional, it is found solely in the Montenegrin lecture introductions. This step makes a connection between other courses and the current lecture, putting topic in appropriate context. Montenegrin professors link what students already know in other courses to the current lecture, as in the following example:

(25) *Ok. Dakle, današnja tema je leksikologija, pa da vidimo šta vi znate o leksikologiji. (zp) Šta je to što ste učili, dakle, iz **predmeta Maternji jezik**? Učili ste pretpostavljam šta je <leksema>, jel' tako? I čime se leksikologija bavi.* (ML$_2$)

'Ok. So, today's topic is lexicology, let's see what you know about lexicology. (zp) So, what is that what you studied in **the course Mother tongue**? You **studied** I suppose what a <lexeme> is, didn't you? And what lexicology deals with.

In Example 25, after the announcement of the current lecture topic, a Montenegrin lecturer poses questions relating to what students already know in the mother tongue course. This way the lecturer, via a comparative approach, builds on students' previous knowledge, as the knowledge in the L1 course is connected with the lecture topic. The professor thus creates a broader contextual framework for the current lecture topic.

5. Conclusion

These findings have revealed specific differences and similarities between the corpora with regard to the move structure of lecture introductions in the linguistics discipline. The major differences the analysis has yielded are the following:

1. Lecture introductions in English have a more elaborate framework including three moves – *Move 1: Orienting the students*, *Move 2: Setting-up lecture framework* and *Move 3: Putting topic in context*. Move 1, composed of the steps *greeting the students* and *thanking the students*, is not a part of the Montenegrin lecture introductions structure. However, as this move is optional, further research into a larger corpus is recommended.

2. The steps *outlining the structure* and *showing the importance/relevance of topic* display a much higher frequency in the British corpus, while the incidence of the step *referring to earlier lecture(s)* is around two times greater in the Montenegrin one. This result suggests that the lecture sequence and the significance of the current topic are more heavily emphasised in the British linguistic lecture introductions, whereas relating what was done in previous lectures to the current topic seems to be more important in the Montenegrin ones.

3. The steps *referring to the exam* and *referring to other course(s)* are only a part of the Montenegrin lecture introductions. This implies the significance of relating the current topic to the future exam, as well as connecting what was learnt in other course(s) to the issue presented in the current lecture. The knowledge from other disciplines linked with linguistics appears to be very useful for students to build upon in the current course content.

The major similarity the British and Montenegrin lecture introductions share lies in the use of two obligatory moves: *Move 2: Setting-up lecture framework* and *Move 3: Putting topic in context* and their similar linguistic signals. This leads to the conclusion that the influence of the lecture genre seems to outweigh that of the language lectures are delivered in. Nonetheless, the abovementioned specific differences should be borne in mind, as they could be of help to British and Montenegrin professors when teaching students who are non-native speakers of English and Montenegrin[1]. "In many university contexts, lecturers are generally not trained in how to lecture" (Lee, 2009, p. 53). This is also the case with the English Language and Literature Department of the University of Montenegro, where its students, preparing for obtaining the degree as English teachers, have an English Language Teaching Methodology course that does not encompass how to give lectures at university level. Additionally, in the context of the internationalisation of universities and the introduction of EMI courses, EMI lecturers also need to

be trained on how to present the lecture content in English, as they are not language experts and need tailor-made EMI support. Hence, the findings might provide the empirical basis for designing syllabi about disciplinary-specific methodology for EMI courses at the level of tertiary education which could include, among other aspects, a focus on the linguistic and rhetorical structures employed by professors in lectures as a type of naturally occurring academic discourse.

As for the resemblance between the model presented and those previously established in the literature, this one is very similar to existing models. However, this model differs when it comes to the steps *referring to the course*, *referring to the exam* and *referring to other course(s)*, which are original to this study. They were not identified in the previous research, which is one of the contributions of the present study. However, future research into a larger corpus is needed to confirm their status with more certainty. Further research could also empirically examine how familiarising students with the structure of lecture introductions influences their comprehension of the lecture content. Further lines of investigation might also include examination of the rhetorical structure and linguistic specificities of the lectures held in English in Montenegro, in comparison with native English speakers' lectures.

This exploratory study has its own limited focus in that it compares relatively small sets of lectures. Albeit enough to describe the rhetorical structure of lecture introductions and its linguistic realisations in two languages, the current corpora could be extended in future research to incorporate more lectures so as to provide broader generalisations taking into account that lectures might vary from one another depending on factors such as lecturing styles or type of lectures.

Given that the knowledge of formal and linguistic schema, i.e. the rhetorical structure of a text and its linguistic features, plays an important role in L1 and L2 language systems, affecting its comprehension in a language (Yang, 2010, p. 175), the current research findings obtained through cross-linguistic study may assist non-Anglophone and Anglophone lecturers and students in becoming more aware of the rhetorical structure of lecture introductions and their linguistic features. Such awareness could help lecturers to be more attentive to their own lecture discourse in university settings, as they may deliver lectures to students of various linguistic backgrounds. On the other hand, by becoming familiar with the rhetorical organization of lecture

introductions students might become more proficient in the lecture comprehension process.

At the theoretical level, the present study may contribute to contrastive linguistics and contrastive literature on academic lectures. "Observations from small-scale studies of a limited set of languages (often only two) form the basis for hypotheses about universal linguistic principles" (Nordrum, 2015: 328). The findings suggest that employing structural and linguistic choices in lectures is a phenomenon concerning not only one language, and, therefore, calls for its further investigation in other language pairs. The current research could be a starting point for additional cross-linguistic explorations of lectures in English and other languages with a potential of adding "explanatory power and theoretical value to contrastive linguistics as a field" (Nordrum, 2015: 328).

References

Ädel, A. (2010). *Just to give you kind of a map of where we are going*: A taxonomy of metadiscourse in spoken and written academic English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 9*(2), 69-97.

Bellés-Fortuño, B. (2018). Evaluative language in medical discourse: A contrastive study between English and Spanish university lectures. *Languages in Contrast*, *18*(2), 155-174.

Bhatia, V.K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.

Biber, D., Johannson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Longman.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language*. Cambridge University Press.

Bugarski, R. (2018). *Govorite li zajednički?* [*Do you speak a mutual language?*]. Biblioteka XX vek.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. Sage.

Chang, Y.Y. (2012). The use of questions by professors in lectures given in English: Influences of disciplinary cultures. *English for Specific Purposes, 31*, 103-116.

Dubois, B.L. (1980). Genre and structure of

biomedical speeches. *Forum Linguisticum*, *5,* 140-169.

Du Bois, J.W. (1991). Transcription design principles for spoken discourse research. *Pragmatics, 1*, 71-106.

Hyland, K. (2013). ESP and writing. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (pp. 95-113). John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). John Benjamins.

Lee, J.J. (2009). Size matters: An exploratory comparison of small- and large-class university lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *28*, 42-57.

Lorés-Sanz, R. (2004). On RA abstracts: From rhetorical structure to thematic organization. *English for Specific Purposes, 23*(3), 280-302.

Nordrum, L. (2015). Review of the book *Contrastive Discourse Analysis – Functional and Corpus Perspectives*, by M. Taboada, S. Doval Suárez & E. González Álvarez (Eds.). *Linguistics and the human sciences, 10*(3), 327-332.

Palmer Silveira, J.C. (2004). Delivery strategies in classroom lectures: Organising the message. In P. Garcés Conejos, R. Gómez Morón, L. Fernández Amaya & M. Padilla Cruz (Eds.), *Current trends in intercultural, cognitive and social pragmatics* (pp. 97-114). Editorial Kronos.

Savić, S. (1993). *Diskurs analiza* [Discourse analysis]. Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.

Shamsudin, S., & Ebrahimi, S.J. (2013). Analysis of the moves of engineering lecture introductions. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 1303-1311.

Sinclair, J.M., & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.

Swales, J. (1981). *Aspects of article introductions*. University of Aston.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, S. (1994). Frameworks and contexts: A genre-based approach to analysing lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *13*(2), 171-186.

Thompson, S.E. (2003). Text-structuring metadiscourse, intonation and the signalling of organization in academic lectures". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*(1), 5-20.

Yaakob, S. (2013). *A genre analysis and corpus based study of university lecture introductions* [Doctoral dissertation]. The University of Birmingham. <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/5241/1/Yaakob14PhD.pdf>

Yang, S.S. (2010). The influence of schema and cultural difference on L1 and L2 reading. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 175-180.

Young, L. (1990). *Language as behaviour, language as code: A study of academic English*. John Benjamins.

Young, L. (1994). University lectures – macro-structure and micro-features. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic listening: Research perspectives* (pp. 159-176). Cambridge University Press.

Branka Živković received her PhD in Linguistics from the University of Montenegro, Faculty of Philology. At the same faculty she teaches Modern English Language 3 – level C1.1, Modern English Language 4 – level C1.2, Functional and Transformational Syntax, as well as Translation of Economic Texts and Translation of Legal Texts from English. At the Faculty of Civil Engineering, the Faculty of Electrical Engineering and the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Montenegro, she teaches English for Specific Purposes. Her main research interests include contrastive linguistics, corpus linguistics, discourse analysis, academic discourse, genre analysis, pragmatics. Her more recent publications have appeared in *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada/Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics, Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística, Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* and *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, among others.

NOTES

[1] The regional varieties of former Serbo-Croatian are also Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian, altogether with Montenegrin being a part of the dialect continuum of South Slavic languages. Although the four languages have become official languages of Bosnia and Hercegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia, they are one language from the linguistic point of view (Bugarski, 2018: 101). They are spoken by "nearly

20 million people in four countries of the western Balkans: the Republics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia" and a large number of speakers living in diaspora (taken from: <https://slavic.ku.edu/why-study-bosniancroatianserbian-bcs-ku-slavic-department>).

[2] The transcriptions used in this study come from the British Academic Spoken English (BASE) corpus, which was developed at the Universities of Warwick and Reading under the directorship of Hilary Nesi (Warwick) and Paul Thompson (Reading). Corpus development was assisted by the Universities of Warwick and Reading, BALEAP, EURALEX, the British Academy and the Arts and Humanities Research Board.

[3] The written part of the BNC is 90%, whereas the spoken part constitutes 10% of the BNC.

[4] Formal permission to record lectures at the University of Montenegro was obtained.

[5] The audio files of the lectures from the BASE corpus are "only available to students and academic staff in the Centre for Applied Linguistics for research and teaching purposes" (taken from: <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/research/collections/base/>). Therefore, seven British lecture transcripts from the BASE corpus were read. The five remaining ones from the BNC and SACLL were both read and listened to. All the Montenegrin lecture transcripts were read and their audio files were listened to.

[6] The second rater is a colleague holding a PhD in applied linguistics with the research interest into discourse and genre analysis.

[7] Its English equivalent is 'with'.

[8] The list is based on accessible literature on transcription symbols used in discourse analysis (Du Bois, 1991; Savić, 1993; Cameron, 2001; Jefferson, 2004).

Appendix 1: Corpora Details.

Lecture codes	Course /Subject	N of words	Lecture duration (h:min:s)
ML$_1$	Contemporary Montenegrin (The syntax of simple and complex sentences)	6,674	48:52
ML$_2$	Introduction to linguistics II	9,757	56:43
ML$_3$	Contemporary Montenegrin (The syntax of cases)	7,321	53:15
ML$_4$	Introduction to linguistics I	7,946	1:05:32
ML$_5$	Sociolinguistics	7,800	1:01:59
ML$_6$	Phonetics	4,218	44
ML$_7$	Discourse analysis	2,220	40:46
ML$_8$	Methodology of teaching language and literature	16,204	1:46:20
ML$_9$	Contemporary Montenegrin (Standardasation and orthography)	3,553	45:36
ML$_{10}$	Contemporary Montenegrin (Orthography with speech culture)	3,535	46:03
ML$_{11}$	Contemporary Montenegrin (Accentology and introduction to dialectology)	4,933	48:53
ML$_{12}$	Semantics	12,605	2:16:27
N of words and total duration		86,766	12:43:26

Table A1.1. Montenegrin corpus details.

Lecture codes	Department/Institution	Lecture title	N of words	Lecture duration (h:min:s)
EL$_1$	Applied Linguistics	Applied linguistics and language teaching	15,745	1:38:47
EL$_2$	CELTE (Centre for English Language Teacher Education)	Collaborative learning	7,473	0:42:07
EL$_3$	CELTE (Centre for English Language Teacher Education)	Dictionaries	8,965	0:55:34
EL$_4$	English	Essay writing and scholarly practice	9,129	0:46:07
EL$_5$	Linguistics	Historical linguistics	8,256	0:47:58
EL$_6$	King's College London	Syntax	6,982	1:02:32
EL$_7$	CELTE (Centre for English Language Teacher Education)	Research methodology: Vocabulary	8,826	0:47:06
EL$_8$	CELTE (Centre for English Language Teacher Education)	Using video tapes in ELT	5,097	1:04:41
EL$_9$	University of Reading (SACLL (Self-Access Center for Language Learning))	Internet linguistics	7,593	50:28
EL$_{10}$	University of Reading (SACLL (Self-Access Center for Language Learning))	Global languages	5,547	51:34
EL$_{11}$	University of Reading (SACLL (Self-Access Center for Language Learning))	The history of English	6,384	43:43
EL$_{12}$	University of Reading (SACLL (Self-Access Center for Language Learning))	The history of writing	4,245	44:47
N of words and total duration			92,242	10:55:24

Table A1.2. British corpus details.

Appendix 2: Transcription symbols

Symbol	Meaning
<>	slower relative to surrounding talk
><	speeded up relative to surrounding talk
-	abrupt cut off of sound
=	overlapping talk
?	rising intonation question
.	closing intonation
(.)	a short pause or gap
(...)	a longer pause or gap
(zp)	filled pause
☺	laugh
_____ _	emphasised relative to surrounding talk
(nejasno)	transcriber unable to hear word
P	professor
S	student
Studenti	students

Table A2.1. Transcription symbols[8].