DE GRUYTER OPEN

DOI: 10.1515/llce-2016-0010

Genre of an Academic Lecture

Valerija Malavska
Turiba University, University of Latvia, Latvia
valerija.malavska@turiba.lv

Abstract

The lecture is one of the most common forms of instruction in universities throughout the world being used as a form of studies, with the aim of conveying knowledge to a large number of students. The article looks at the nature of the academic lecture genre, its specific characteristics in comparison to other types of written or spoken modes of different genres. It introduces key theories of Genre Schools, such as New Rhetoric Studies, Systemic Functional Linguistics and English for Specific Purposes, explores the peculiarities of the university lecture as a separate genre, looks at its structure and studies the characteristic features.

Keywords

academic lecture genre, core and secondary genres, interdiscursivity, intertextuality, interdisciplinarity

Introduction

The author of the present article aimed at investigating the characteristic features of an academic lecture by looking at the findings of the schools of Genre studies and studying the probable macro-structure of a lecture. The idea underpinning the study was to find out the common features and peculiarities that are characteristic to contemporary lectures delivered in English as lingua franca to international students regardless of the field of their study with the further practical application of lecture structural models in the improvement of the efficiency of non-native speaking lecturers' discourse or preparing prospective and novice lecturers.

Theoretical Framework

During the last several decades, linguists have directed their attention to the study of written text and spoken discourse, including the lecture as a central spoken genre in higher education in Europe and many countries world-wide (e.g. Flowerdew 1994; Miller 2002). Three schools of Genre Studies were formed - New Rhetoric Studies, Systemic Functional Linguistics and English for Specific Purposes, though all three have been preoccupied with some specific study of genres, the distinction between the approaches is often vague, so they can be seen as complementary, rather than competing approaches.

New Rhetoric Studies (Hyon, 1996; Johns, 2002) is also called Rhetorical Genre Studies (RGS) with the term RGS coined by Freedman (1999, 2001) and developed by Bawarshi and Reiff (2010). The approach to discourse implicit in RGS was first introduced in Carolyn Miller's article "Genre as Social Action" (1984/1994). Miller (in Freedman and Medway, 1994) explained the significance of the genre studies for the pedagogical needs: "for the student, genres serve as keys to understanding how to participate in the actions of a community", for example, academic genres (a seminar, a workshop or a lecture) are usually tailored in such a way (linguistically) that help learners associate the specialized knowledge (linguistic forms, terminology, functional language) they acquire in the academic setting with their profession, get prepared for the active participation in the discourse community they will be representing, for example, work in the tourism industry for the students of the faculty of Tourism.

Miller (1984) proposed to consider genre as a social action, Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995) claimed that genres „can be modified according to rhetorical circumstances", "genres evolve, develop and decay", and in other words, although genres have a certain form, they should not be viewed as static texts as they can be modified depending on the communicative situation.

Systemic Functional Genre Studies, often known as 'the Sydney School' of genre studies, (Hyon, 1996) lay out their theoretical foundation on the works of Halliday (1994); Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), Halliday and Hasan (1976, 1985), and Martin (1984, 1992) who considered language primarily as a resource for making meaning, rather than as a set of rules. The importance of meanings in context is vividly shown in the quotation of one of the forefathers of the SFL approach Halliday (1985:10) who claimed that "for a linguist, to describe language without accounting for text is sterile; to describe text without relating it to language is vacuous." SFL involves the notion that language consists of a set of systems which offers the writer/speaker choices in expressing meanings. Systemic functional linguistics views meaning as social, where social meaning impacts on linguistic forms and the role of form is to serve a social function. Genre by SFL researchers is considered:

- social because people participate in genres with other people;
- goal-oriented because they use genres to get things done;

- staged because it usually takes a few steps to reach people's goals. (Martin and Rose, 2003)

Martin (2001) (in Nunan, 2008) differentiated between spoken and written genres, where the first may include "casual conversations, academic lectures, political speeches, talk show interviews", and so on, whereas the second group includes: "recounts, narratives, procedures, reports, explanations, expositions and discussions." Representatives of Australian movement of genre studies the Functional School of Genre theory looked at the functions of different texts. Users of separate genres may always keep in mind the functions and aims of the texts that they create, whether the aim is achieved and whether the choice of linguistic features is appropriate to the aim of that specific genre. For example, a love letter will look ridiculous if the formal cliché style of commercial correspondence is used or a lecturer may sound unprofessional if he uses only private informal examples from his personal experience to illustrate some concepts or ideas in the course of a lecture.

Having investigated findings by Halliday (1978), Halliday and Hasan (1985) and Martin (1992), Trappes-Lomax in Paltidge (2004) the following models and approaches pertinent to SFL were set out:

- "Language is seen not only as an autonomous system, but as a part of the wider socio-cultural context;
- language has a meaning potential – speakers and writers simultaneously represent experience (the ideational function), manage their relationship with the co-participants (the interpersonal function) and produce dialogue or monologue (the textual function);
- the realization of the meta-functions can be discerned at the micro-level of clause-structure and at the macro-level of context (register features: field, tenor and mode);
- systemic functional linguistics provides a comprehensive theory of text analysis and genre."

The English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Genre Theory (Bhatia, 1993, Swales, 1990, Flowerdew, 1993, Hopkins and Dudley-Evans, 1988, St John, 1998) has investigated genres in order to incorporate a better understanding of how language is structured to achieve goals in specific contexts of use. The theory has been especially welcomed by language teachers because of the expanding number of culturally and linguistically diverse students. The term 'genre' was first introduced in ESP in 1981 in an article by Tarone and her colleagues (Paltridge, 2001).The area of interest included spoken and written language of non-native speakers in academic and professional settings. Swales (1990, 2000, 2001, and 2004), who has become a crucial figure in ESP, has identified two key characteristics of ESP genre analysis:

- focus on academic and research English and
- use of genre analysis for applied ends (Swales, 1990).

Swales discussed quantitative studies of the linguistic properties of registers of a language with the purpose of identifying frequency of occurrence of certain linguistic features in a particular register. The linguist referred to genres as 'communicative events' with special 'communicative purposes' that possess their own "structure, style, content and intended audience" (Swales, 1990:58). The specific 'communicative purposes' are determined by the members of a 'discourse community' who provide the rationale and constrain the discourse structure, content, and purposes of a certain genre, and define its rhetorical functions. By the term 'discourse community' Swales (1990:466) means a group of people who share common purposes, and the setting of communication, for example, university lecturers and students of the same faculty who attend lectures. Later Flowerdew (2015) reviewed Swales's approach to pedagogy in Genre Analysis, acknowledged and elaborated on his concept of discourse community and suggested six characteristics relevant to discourse communities, which will be looked through below from the perspective of an academic lecture:

1. "Common public goals" – the common goal of the lecture participants – lecturer and students is the exchange and acquisition of new knowledge;
2. "Mechanisms of intercommunication among its members" (for example, lecture room, seminar room);
3. "Membership within a discourse community depends on individuals using these mechanisms to participate in the life of the discourse community" (students' and lecturers' background/ experience and the language competence);
4. "Discourse community utilizes and possesses one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of the aims"; these genres must be recognized by members of a discourse community (for example, lectures on Sustainable Finance may be better understood and discussed by the students studying finance rather than medicine, whereas medical discourse will most probably be problematic for the discourse community of business or finance studies);
5. "Discourse community has acquired some specific lexis, which can take the form of shared and specialized terminology, such as abbreviations and acronyms" This way, for example, a student who studies medicine might experience initial difficulties in understanding professional financial terminology, especially, acronyms and abbreviations. In other words, representatives of each discourse community possess specialized lexical stocks and schemata knowledge of the profession which can be ambiguous for the representatives of other discourse communities. This may mean that the content and the lexical units of the specialized subjects of other fields delivered to students for whom this subject is out of their professional circle have to be simplified to some extent and adapted to the needs of the target audience.
6. "A discourse community has a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discoursal expertise" who can pass on knowledge

of shared goals and communicative purposes to new members. So, shared goals and discoursal expertise of lecturers in the specific field are sent to the target audience (students) who in the course of time start belonging to the same discourse community as their lecturers.

Bawarshi (2010) who has provided the classification of all three genre schools considered that "a typical ESP approach to genre analysis will begin by identifying a genre within a discourse community and defining the communicative purpose the genre is designed to achieve. From there, the analysis turns to an examination of the genre's organization – its schematic structure – often characterized by the rhetorical "moves", and then to an examination of the textual and linguistic features (style, tone, voice, grammar, syntax) that realize the rhetorical moves." In other words, a linguist who wants to do the analysis of some text or discourse will proceed from a genre's schematic structure to the lexico-grammatical features, and as Flowerdew noted (1992), the process tends "to move from text to context."

Although the three Schools of Genre studies developed separately in different geographical areas and were focused on different objects of study, they have much in common. Both Sydney School and the ESP Genre School stressed the need to recognize the social dimension of genre ("genres are social actions"); emphasized the addressee, the context and the occasion (Adam and Artemeva, 1982). The difference between systemicists and ESP specialists lies in the target audience, where the former focuses on students who acquire English as a second language or whose English skills need improvement and the primary audience of the latter are students in EFL situations or those who study English for academic purposes. The present research will use findings of all three Schools described above, for example Bakhtin's (New Rhetoric School) views on speech genres, Halliday's (SFL) dimensions of tenor, field and mode, Swales's views on genre studies and other findings.

Genre, Register, Discourse, Style

Genre studies go back to the Ancient Greek times when Greek rhetoricians pointed out the systemic differences in purpose and structure between lyrics, epics and other literary forms. Aristotele in his *Poetics* used the word genre in the meaning of 'kind' or 'form' to refer to major types of literature: poetry, drama and the epic.

The present research requires the explanation and exemplification of the concepts *genre, register, discourse* and *styl*e since they are often encountered in diverse interpretations in the theories of genre, discourse, corpus linguistics and other studies and can sometimes be confusing and misleading for the readership.

As we have previously seen 'genre' was presented by the scholars of all three schools of genre studies as a multi-dimensional and a complex concept. The present part of the article will provide definitions by all three schools and will find those most suitable for the present research. Bakhtin (1986) defined genres as "relatively stable

types of . . . utterances" within which words and sentences attain typical expressions, relations, meanings, and boundaries, and within which exist "typical conception[s] of the addressee" and typical forms of addressivity. Other scholars of the New Rhetoric School, for example, Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995) considered that "genres are dynamic rhetorical forms that develop from responses to recurrent situations and serve to stabilize experience and give it coherence and meaning", Freadman (1994), Devitt (1991), and Orlikowski and Yates (1994) claimed that genres do not exist in isolation but rather in dynamic interaction with other genres.

Nunan (2007), representing ESP School of genre studies defined genre as "a purposeful, socially constructed oral or written text such as narrative, a casual conversation, a poem, a recipe or a description. Each genre has its own characteristic structure and grammatical form that reflects its social purpose." Nunan's definition of genre explains in a simple way that in order to belong to a specific genre, the text needs to have some social purpose, it should have different characteristics in structure and grammar, however the definition does not seem to be complete because it does not explain what exact characteristics the text may possess. One may find a more detailed definition of genre in the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics (1999) compiled on the basis of the works of the representatives of ESP school of genre theory Bhatia (1993), Cook (1992) and Swales (1990):

> "Genres are types of spoken and written discourse recognized by a discourse community. Examples are lectures, conversations, speeches, notices, advertisements, novels, diaries, shopping lists. Each genre has typical features. Some may be linguistic (particular grammatical or lexical choices), some paralinguistic (e.g. print size, gesture) and some contextual and pragmatic (e.g. setting, purpose). Some genres overlap (a joke may also be a story) and one can contain another (a joke can be a part of a story)..."

This perception of genres as if clarifies Nunan's definition by specifying what characteristics/features genres may vary in: linguistics, paralinguistic, contextual and pragmatic. It also states the intertextual or interdiscursive aspect of genres, for instance, the speech of a lecturer may include quotations and stories from other texts by other authors, the so-called process of recontextualisation can be noticed in the discourse.

Some SFL scholars (Halliday, 1978; Frow, 1980) viewed the concepts of genre and register as synonyms whereas others, for example, Martin (1985) strongly differentiated between these two concepts. Martin considered genre being realized through registers, and registers being realized through languages. That is why the text from one genre may contain elements of tenor, mode and field from another text of another genre. The contextual variables of 'field', 'tenor' and 'mode', first introduced by Halliday (1985/89) have been elaborated on by Martin and Nunan, who claimed that 'field' refers to what and where something is going on, for example, tennis, opera, linguistics, cooking, building, construction, farming, education and so on. Martin (2001) considered

that 'tenor' is connected with personal relationships between the individuals involved in an activity, "e.g. the degree of power between two interactants will determine how a particular event is carried out", whereas 'mode' refers to the channel of communication, whether the text is written or spoken, if it is a face-to-face conversation or a telephone conversation. Nunan (2008) also suggested that two texts that are delivered to the receiver via different modes can belong to the same genre. The example provided by Nunan (ibid) shows that one and the same task discussed by the same interlocutors but using different channels (modes: face-to-face and a telephone conversation) brings to different text types within the same genre. Field and tenor remain the same, but the modes change. The difference between the definitions of genre and register proposed by Nunan (2008) is that genre relates to the context of culture, but register relates to the context of situation.

In the context of the present study, the concept ***genre*** will be used to refer to the social processes existing in institutional contexts and fulfilling communicative purposes; ***register*** will allow relating text and context through the features of 'field', 'tenor' and 'mode'. In the context of the present study the 'filed' refers to topic, theme of the lecture, a so called 'social activity', 'tenor' answers the question 'Who' and applies to the status of participants – in our case – lecturer and students, ascribes the relationship and the interpersonal skills of the actors, whereas 'mode' is concerned with the channel of communication, the format in which communication takes place, for example, a lecture as well as the format in which the lecture occurs, this is spoken mode. We agree that the constituencies of register may differ, but not necessarily the genre will immediately change, consequently, the lecturer's speech may change from monologue to the interactive mode of information delivery, however it will still belong to the genre of an academic lecture.

The 'mode' continuum suggested by Nunan (2008) can be adapted to the purposes of acquiring the content within academic genres and can be depicted as follows:

Table 1 Channel of Communication

Face-to-face interaction (e.g. seminar, workshop)	Monological type of lecture	Webinar / Skype lecture	Handouts / Textbook / Report	Use of Internet resources for distant learning and blended learning, e.g. Moodle

Immediate feedback ⟷ Delayed feedback

Depending on the possibility of contact between the interlocutors (in our case a lecturer and students) the 'quality' of feedback may differ from immediate to delayed: the interactive style presupposes a two-way communication, the closer there is the verbal contact between interlocutors, the more chance there exists for the immediate feedback, the easier way speakers may interfere into the conversation, ask, interrupt and

fulfil other communicative functions. A monological style involves active role of a speaker - speech of one participant and more passive roles of listeners (students) - the listening process of other 'stakeholders' who may have a "responsive attitude" (Bakhtin,1986) toward the speech, the feedback is less noticeable because participants (students) do not share their thoughts aloud although they may have inner mental processes taking place, that can be accompanied with the non-verbal behaviour demonstrating their feedback, the feedback can also be delayed until the moment when listeners (students) have to demonstrate the acquired knowledge in any form of test. Communication in a distant form, for example a lecture by Skype or a webinar may evoke immediate feedback when students ask or write questions and provide comments, however due to some technical discrepancies that can sometimes occur, students' feedback can be more delayed than during face-to-face communication. Written genres, such as, for example, reports, handouts and textbooks that may also serve as a study form do not presuppose the immediate feedback since they require more time for the cognitive processing of information – reading, considering and only then coming back with the reaction in the form of test, oral communication with a lecturer or any other form of test of knowledge.

Biber and Conrad (2009) differentiated among the terms 'register' and 'style' referring them to different perspectives on text varieties. They considered that the difference of style and register lies in the fact that style "reflects aesthetic preferences" of a particular author in some particular historical period. Style is connected with the individual use of language; it can also reflect the preferences of the user, for example, laconic style of writing or speech versus open and generous use of language or, the use of a monologue-type lecture versus an interactive style with a lot of student engagement.

Leech and Short (in Norgaad, 2010) define style as "the way in which language is used in a given context, by a given person, for a given purpose and so on." Style is restricted to the style of an author / speaker and can be characteristic of a situation, a character, a text, linguistic expressions used over time.

'Discourse' is a more general concept that includes 'genre' and the 'register' of some particular genre. It is "language above the sentence" or "language produced and interpreted in a real-world context" (Cameron, 2001). Discourse implies the use of both spoken and written modes of language.

ESP scholars, such as Paltridge (2006), Richards and Schmidt (2002) defined genre as a type of discourse that takes place in a particular setting, has "distinctive and recognizable patterns and norms of organization and structure" (ibid) and has distinctive communicative functions. Genre is considered as if a kind of structure for discourse where genre shapes the content and purpose of discourse and consequently any type of genre-based discourse has a particular content that people expect within this genre. So, if we want to organize all the above-mentioned concepts in the framework of their

meanings, then genre would be placed between discourse and register in the hierarchy, whereas style would follow register:

Table 2 Conceptual Framework

Discourse → Genre → Register → Style

Any discourse will belong to some specific genre, dependent on the communicative purposes of the speaker, whereas the genre will use some specific register, for instance a written mode or an oral mode, with the individual stylistic features of the author. So, for example, academic discourse may have different genres within it (lecture, seminar, workshop, conference, class, webinar, text book), whereas all these genres may belong to different modes (spoken, written, face-to-face, monologue, dialogue, conversation, etc.) with one speaker choosing the individual style (e.g. preferring reading aloud, whereas another speaker choosing to interact with students and to engage them in communication).

The table below was worked out by the author of the present article on the basis of the definitions of 'genre' by SFL and ESP scholars and demonstrates the example of the above hierarchy and the possible variations:

Table 3 Examples of Academic Discourse

Genre / Communicative Purpose	**Register**	**Style**
Academic lecture / to explain/ deliver new information to students	Field: (setting) lecture room, (theme) e.g. Marketing, Tenor: lecturer, students, Mode: spoken interaction / written text in the slides.	**Monological style** Use of Power Point slides. One way interaction. Individual style of the lecturer.
Academic lecture / to explain/ deliver new information to students, to make a discussion	Field: (setting) lecture room, (theme)e.g. subject in Marketing, Tenor: Lecturer, students, Mode: Spoken interaction / written text in the slides	**Interactive style** (involvement of students in communication); use of Power Point slides. Individual style of the speaker.
Seminar / Discuss the subject, find out the ideas, knowledge of students in the particular area	Field: (setting) **seminar room**, (theme) e.g. subject in Marketing, Tenor: **Students**, **lecturer**, Mode: Spoken interaction.	**Interactive style** (involvement of students in communication); use of Power Point slides. Individual style of the speaker.
Conference / Share knowledge, get new ideas	Field: (setting) Conference **room**, (theme) e.g. subject in Marketing	Presentations with the use of Power Point.

	Tenor: Academic staff, Mode: Spoken interaction / written text in the slides.	Individual style of the speaker.
Textbook	Field: subject in Marketing Tenor: Academic staff, students from the same academic discourse community, Mode: written text.	Individual style of the writer.

The present table demonstrates that texts of different registers and genres can belong to the category of similar discourse (academic discourse) regardless of whether they are of spoken or written mode.

Genre of the Academic Lecture

The lecture is one of the most common forms of instruction in universities throughout the world. All educational institutions use the lecture as a form of studies, with the aim of conveying knowledge to a large number of students (Buckley, 2000; Custers and Boshuizen, 2002; Pettu, 2001). Lectures are an example of genre, they may be attended by the students of mathematics, but also by the students in other fields, therefore lectures represent a genre, but not a register. Lectures are supposed to be delivered by experts who possess practical and theoretical knowledge in the field of their subject, have excellent presentation-making and socializing skills; lecturers are able to give examples of practical application and to relate personal experience with the content of the lecture. A successful lecture would be presenting relevant content to the motivated audience in the appropriate setting, delivering "value-laden discourses in which lecturers not only present information to the audience, but also express their attitudes and evaluation of the materials" (Thomson, 1994, Lee, 1990, 1994).

Social science lectures delivered through the spoken channel are also characterized by social relations of the participants and their mutual interaction (lecturer – student, student-student, and student - lecturer). However, sometimes lecturers prefer to choose the monological type of lecture that is deprived of any interaction with the target audience, is speaker-focused and does not expect students' feedback.

Lecture is an example of an 'oral academic genre' which has been studied by such researchers as Giménez (2000), Bellés and Fortanet (2004) or 'pedagogical process genre' (Thompson, 1994, Lee, 2008). Representatives of ESP school of genre studies (Carter and McCarthy, 1997) consider lecture a pedagogical genre, Camiciottoli (2007) who represents school of Systemic Functional Linguistics considers that a lecture is a genre realized through the *pedagogic register*, "featuring the informational content of the lecture as *field*, the lecturer-audience relationship as *tenor* and face-to-face spoken language as *mode*" (ibid.). The lecturer is supposed to fulfill different functions during a lecture: to describe objects, notions, concepts or events in their static and dynamic

form, to narrate, creating a sequence of events, where there are the stages of problem crisis, and solution or resolution, to inform, explain, discuss, develop cause and effect arguments, to provide definitions, to compare and draw conclusions. This process is ensured by the fact that lecturers usually are aware of the genre specifics of the academic lecture. As Flowerdew (1994) pointed out, lecture research: "knowledge of the linguistic/discoursal structure of lectures will be of value to content lecturers in potentially enabling them to structure their own lectures in an optimally effective way."

Academic lecture as a separate genre may be attributed to the secondary genre (Bakhtin, 1986), since a modern lecture is a combination of written and spoken genres – the text in the Power Point presentation often includes quotations from other texts (written or oral); the lecturer uses theoreticians' quotations while delivering the lecture; thus, he bases his discourse on the texts of other authors.

On the other hand, each lecture is an example of the individual style of a lecturer, each new lecture is unique and cannot be reproduced word for word by any other lecturer, even by the same author, because the cognitive and communicative processes are dynamic, ever-changing, and situative (occurring in relation to a specific situation) that may be dependent on such circumstances as target audience (e.g. students), setting (lecture room), time of the lecture, et cetera.

The idea of Bakhtin (1968) about "responsive attitude" of speech communication may be applied to the situation of an academic (university) lecture – students' perception of the lecturer's discourse does not always result in an immediate response but can lead to delayed action – a student uses thoughts and words of a lecturer in his further work in the subject – a test, a seminar, creating a written text and later, hopefully in the course of his professional life. As Bakhtin (1986) stated: "any speaker is himself a respondent to a greater or lesser degree" as a result, any utterance produced by a speaker is a "complexly organized chain of other utterances." In other words, both a lecturer and students become speakers and respondents who reproduce other speakers' utterances. Moreover, the lecturer may also use students' ideas and words; the so called cyclic process takes place.

An important characteristic of spoken genre is the fact that there is no direct distinction between a sentence and an utterance in the speech (Bakhtin, ibid). It is important to note that not always the boundaries of sentences are determined by the change of the speaking subject. This peculiarity of speech that can be noticed while listening to an academic lecture can cause a problem with the lecture perception; this may occur in the situation when a lecturer is not a good orator and does not use pauses for the demonstration of the change of the topic or end of the theme, or uses pauses in places that mislead the listeners from the right perception of the lecture.

The idea of '**speech plan**' (Bakhtin, 1986) or 'educational exigence' sounds applicable in the context of a university lecture – the lecturer has a plan of his speech that he follows, does not matter, how spontaneous or improvising the discourse may

sometimes sound; the lecture is a separate genre, that expects a lecturer choosing the most applicable forms of address to the audience, using specific terminology, characteristic to the subject being taught.

The lecture is characterized by such concepts as '**involvement'** and '**detachment'** (Chafe, 1982) – different concerns and relations that speakers and writers have with their audience. Unlike writers who are removed from their audience, lecturers need to communicate and to reflect their own emotional participation – 'experiential involvement' (Chafe, ibid). The importance of the lecturer, his presence / authority in the discourse he creates – expression of personal feelings, attitudes and emotions (Biber and Finegan, 1989), 'stance' have been studied by Biber (1994).

Lecture is an interactive and an involving activity. The characteristic features are the use of special lexical-grammatical elements that serve different functions, for example, inviting students to speak, asking, confirming, disagreeing, and etcetera. The interactional dimension of speech has been elaborated by Goffman (1981) who sees speech as "participation framework", he (1981) distinguished different speaker production formats that include:

- 'animator' (the person who physically produces the text / speech)
- 'author' (the person who is the author of the speech) and
- 'principle' (the person or organization who endorse the content of the speech)

Goffman recognized the triple role of lecturers as principal, author and animator all in the same person and whose 'status' can change when, for example, a lecturer shifts to a more personal self, e.g. digressing from the topic of a lecture.

Another characteristic feature of the academic lecture as a genre is the aspect of '**contextuality'**, '**situationality'** or '**improvisation'**. The lecture, does not matter how many times the lecturer has spoken about the same topic, is always delivered at the moment of speaking; it is a flow of speech that is dynamic, never static, never the same. The main characteristics of the academic discourse could be:

- The speech of a lecturer should be logical and consistent;
- The speech should be systematic and clear;
- The speech elements can be of standard type, lecturers may use cliché – type phrases in the metadiscourse of a lecture;
- The speech should be objective;
- The speech should be unambiguous;
- The speaker should be laconic;
- The speech should have intellectual expressivity.

It is important to note that the lecture as a genre is **changing** and has changed a lot from the times when it was first used as a pedagogical form from old-fashioned "chalk and talk" (as information transmission) and "sage on the stage" (an educator, who imparts knowledge by lecturing to an audience; the method of imparting knowledge

used by such an educator) to a more interactive and more constructive "guide on the side" (King, 1993).

Genre mixing (Helal, 2013) has become a contemporary trend of a modern lecture – a combination of spoken and written / formal and informal registers, supplementing of speech with the use of visual materials demonstrated with the help of various modern means. Decades ago it was an overhead projector, today these are programmes such as PowerPoint, YouTube, Prezi, Elluminate Live, VoiceThread, Adobe Captivate and other technical aids.

Aguilar (2004) quoted in Camiciotolli (2004) has mentioned the **hybrid nature** of peer seminars, sharing some features with lectures, conference presentations and written research article. However, the hybrid nature can be attributed to a genre of an academic lecture too, because lectures today often are a mixture of different pedagogical genres: a research article that may be quoted by a lecturer, a seminar, when a lecturer invites students to interact; group work, discussion or a conference, when a lecturer asks students to present some works within the lecture.

A lecture today is "a remarkably adaptable and robust genre that combines textual record and ephemeral event, and that is capable of addressing a range of different demands and circumstances, both practical and epistemological" (Friesen, 2011). Böhme (quoted in Friesen 2011: 101) introduced the term "transmedial culture" to denote the significance and the emphasis of media on the modern culture in pedagogy.

The use of multiple sources of information both in oral and verbal ways makes the process of lecture more complex and the perception of lecture by students more intricate. Students today are forced to multitask –not only listening to the speaker and taking notes, but following the speech and reading the written text from the screen, perceiving video-recorded volumes of information. As a result, information processing is becoming more complex.

The academic lecture can be an example of '**interdiscursivity'** (Foucault (1969), Fairclough (2003) - one genre interacting with another – for example a genre which represents a combination of spoken discourse (speech of a lecture) and written mode (Power Point presentation) and '**intertextuality'** (Kristeva, 1980; Bakhtin, 1981, 1986) having texts created by lectures on the bases of other texts and adding stories or quotations of other authors into the newly-created text (discourse). Bakhtin (1981, 1986) emphasized the 'dialogic' qualities of texts, that is, how multiple voices are transformed , Kristeva (1986) talked about the ways in which texts and ways of talking refer to and build on other texts and discourses (Kristeva 1986). Recent ESP approaches to genre study acknowledge the dynamic and interactive nature of genres (Bawarshi and Reif, 2010), they attend to what Swales calls "genre chains", "genre systems" (Bazerman, 1994), "genre sets" (Devitt, 1991) – taking into account other genres with which the target genre interacts and "intertextuality"– borrowings from other texts, one genre interacting with another, one genre is necessary antecedent for another" (Swales,

2004) or as Counine (in Fairclough, 1992) called it "separating an interior and an exterior". Fairclough (1992) and Hyatt (2003) use the term "interdiscursivity". Intertextuality may take various forms, Flowerdew (2013) summarized the findings on it (Kristeva, 1980, Bakhtin, 1981, 1986, Fairclough, 1992, Devitt, 1991) and worked out the typology of intertextuality. The author of the present article adapted it for the purposes of the analysis of the intertextuality of academic lectures.

Table 4 Types of Intertextuality in the Academic Discourse

Type of intertextuality	**Definition**	**Source**
Manifest intertextuality = Horizontal	Quotation, citation and paraphrase	Fairclough (1992a) Kristeva (1986)
Constitutive intertextuality = Vertical intertextuality	Refers to merging prior texts in new texts which may assimilate, contradict, or ironically echo them	Fairclough (1992a) Kristeva (1986)
Functional intertextuality	When a text is part of a larger system of texts dealing with a particular issue	Devitt (1991)

All these types of intetextuality are interconnected, although lecture as a separate genre is mostly characterized by "manifest intertextuality" (horizontal) when the lecturer quotes other authors on whose materials his course is based, paraphrases or generalizes the citations of others manifesting their ideas in discourse, projecting their identities in his text. "Constitutive intertextuality" (vertical) in a lecture discourse may be noticed if the speaker exemplifies several authors who contradict one to another or quote something ironically. Since the course usually contains a series of consequent lectures, 'functional intertextuality' may also be observed, when the lecturer continues a new lecture with the use of information from the previous lecture.

Finally, it is worth mentioning Camiciottoli (2007) who pointed at the interconnected nature of the concepts of interdiscursivity and intertextuality relating to the academic lecture:

"When preparing lectures, speakers often draw from texts written by others and refer to these explicitly during the lecture itself. While speaking, they may make reference to various written texts, such as a textbooks, handouts, overhead slides or writing on the chalkboard. Thus, formal written texts are transformed into spoken discourse of a more conversational and interactive nature, thus rendering their concepts more accessible to learners."

Interdisciplinarity may be called as another important feature of academic lecture genre. It applies to social science lectures delivered in English, since a lecturer is not only a subject expert but also a language researcher – one who is obliged to make mental notes on terminology – looking for the translations of concepts, thinking about the

appropriate formulation of sentences in a foreign language. Lectures are always interdisciplinary because there is no science that is purely homogenous. Most social science lectures incorporate topics from other disciplines, for example, the subject Intercultural Communication may include information of such subjects as History, Linguistics, Anthropology, Geography, Economics, Social Psychology, Communication, Information Technologies, Globalization and others. Moreover, a modern lecture today comprises the use of statistics, visual arts (e.g. graphics, diagrams), social sciences and other disciplines.

Macro - Structure of an Academic Lecture

It was admitted (Wijasuriya, 1982; Lebauer, 1984; Chaudron and Richards, 1986, Flowerdew, 1994) that an inability to recognize macro-structure of a lecture is seen as one of the main problems of non-native speakers in understanding lectures. Understanding the formal structure of a lecture facilitates better understanding, planning and delivery to the target audience. In "Advice to a Lecturer", Michael Faraday, described the following on the lecturer, "his thoughts … and his mind clear from the contemplation and description of his subject"; on diction," a lecturer should endeavor … to obtain … the power of clothing his thoughts and ideas in language smooth and harmonious and at the same time simple and easy. His periods should be complete and expressive, conveying clearly the whole of the ideas" (cited by Murray, 1999).

The present part aims at eliciting the possible theoretical findings on structuring an academic lecture through the overview of the rhetorical and move analysis of Systemic Functional School of genre studies and English for Special Purposes genre studies and to create the model most suitable for the structural analysis of the academic lecture discourse.

The university lecture discourse is not purely monological, neither fully dialogical; it is oriented towards the audience as well as expects the audience interaction. The structural analysis of lecture extracts can allow finding out the successes and possible reasons of failures of the lecturer-student interaction in the course of a lecture.

The Systemic Functional Linguistics that laid the groundwork for the studies of spoken language within the tradition of Discourse Analysis has described the classroom discourse that deals with the interactions between the teacher and individual students in school settings (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975) as a series of three-part exchanges: Initiation – Response – Feedback (IRF), which contain 21 functional moves, for example, framing, focusing, answering, et cetera. Coulthard and Sinclair (1975, 2002) studied the classroom interaction and developed the Discourse Analysis (DA) model to analyze spoken discourse that is also known as the Birmingham model or, at the level of *exchange*, the Initiation-Response-Follow-up structure (IRF). They initially differentiated two ranks: *utterance* and *exchange*, where "*utterance* was defined as everything said by one speaker before another began to speak, and *exchange* as two or

more utterances." Later following Bellack (1966) they added another category move because a two-way exchange is not always the case, often "moves combine to form utterances which in turn combine to form exchanges." It was agreed to express the structure of exchanges in terms of moves. A three layer structure of interaction in the classroom was introduced: *initiation* by the teacher, followed by a *response* from the pupil, followed by *feedback*. The boundaries in the lesson noticed by Sinclair and Coulthard (ibid:3) were indicated by functional words 'right', 'well', 'good', 'OK', 'now', that occurred in the speech of all teachers. The term *frame* was used to mark off the "settling-down time" (ibid), (*such as now, now then*); *focus* was used to denote "metastatements about the discourse". By metastatements they meant statement about the statement, it is probable to suppose that the term was not frequently used and can be interchangeable with the concept *metadiscourse* - linguistic features commenting on the content of the text - that was studied by Hyland (2005, 2009). Other terminology introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard (ibid) included transaction, lesson, period and act. The final DA model contained the ranking scale of 4 components in descending order of hierarchy: transaction, *exchange*, *move* and *act*. Thus, the structure of transaction by Sinclair and Coulthard (ibid) consisted of units of exchanges, exchange units of moves, and move units of acts. The model has evolved and expanded (Coulthard and Montgomery (1981), Sinclair and Brazil (1982), and Sinclair and Coulthard (1992)) to allow the application of less-structured discourse.

IRF model is perfect for the analysis of everyday speech and classroom talk, but since the traditional academic speech that is the object of the present study has lengthy episodes of lecturer speaking (with some interruptions for questions made by students) and is much more complex by its structure than a school lesson this model cannot be considered as the only one or the most appropriate for the analysis of lecture discourse.

Move analysis was also initiated by ESP school - Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993) who studied the interconnection of "communicative purposes" and properties of texts claimed that people who belong to the same discourse community and regularly participate in some genre "share similar communicative purposes" (Flowerdew, 2013) that are expressed in a series of "staged" moves. The most frequently quoted model among ESP practitioners is the CARS model ('Create A Research Space') by Swales (1990) who looked at academic research article introductions and attributed to moves and steps the characteristics of being 'obligatory or optional', 'sequencing', and even 'embedded one within another' (ibid) Swales's model is represented by three stable 'moves' and 'steps' that serve as sub-moves, he described texts as a sequence of rhetorical moves: Establishing a territory (Move 1), Establishing a niche (Move 2), Occupying the niche (Move 3) with the corresponding steps/sub-moves (for example, Move 1 including Claiming *centrality, Making topic generalization(s), Reviewing items of previous research*).This model is applicable for the professional and academic writers, it has been adapted to teaching research papers, for example Swales's "Writing

for Graduate Students"(2001) that was designed to help non-native students with their academic writing based on the texts from a wide array of disciplines (from medical engineering to music theory). We consider that CARS model is suitable for the analysis and development of written texts, however it is not very applicable for the analysis of spoken academic discourse that is less rigid, less structured and can have more variations in style.

Thompson (1994) used Swales's (1990) rhetorical move analysis to describe the structure of lecture introductions. She noted that lecturers appear to be ''aware . . . of the need to set up a framework for the lecture discourse and provide a context for the new information to come" (Thompson, 1994) however, she pointed out that lecture introductions seem to lack a preferred rhetorical order and also vary in their move structure. She concluded that rather than having a typical move structure, lecture introductions are a largely unpredictable mix of two discrete functions - *setting up lecture framework* and *putting the topic in contex*t and their respective subfunctions (for example, announcing topic). Thompson (ibid) gave a very clear model for the lecture introduction but it did not include enough of the introduction part as well as functions because she was mostly concerned with the development of listening to lectures.

The exploratory study by Lee (2009) who investigated the impact of class size on the rhetorical move structures and lexico-grammatical features of academic lecture introductions is of interest for the purpose of our study because he extended Thompson's model and proposed three moves, including *Warming up, Setting up the lecture framework and Putting the topic in contex*t. The researcher subdivided the moves not into sub-functions but into steps, put next to each step evaluation of whether it is obligatory or optional in the lecture setting depending on the size of the audience.

We will take all the moves and steps by Lee into consideration of the present research without accounting for the number of attendees since all of them were noticed in the course of observing the soft science lectures, independent of the size of the group. According to Lee (ibid) Move 1 acts as an introduction to the forthcoming lecture, giving students time to attend to other matters about the course that may or may not be related to the current lecture. Step 1 *Making a digression* allows the lecturer to offer students "general course information and course-related asides (or digressions). Digressions as often unconscious for the lecturers technique is often used by them to lighten up the content of the lecture, for example, self-mention, joking. As Camiciottoli (2005) put it: "asides or digressions serve as a way for lecturers to create a relaxed environment and maintain a positive lecturer–audience relationship." Step 2 *Housekeeping* may provide information about organizational *issues*, the lecture that is not going to take place or is postponed, step 3 *Looking ahead* may be connected with the future actions (for example, instructions to read some texts to foster the course understanding, to prepare for the test or exam).

Move 2 is concerned with the introduction of the topic of the lecture realized through step 1 *Announcing the topic*, step 2 *Indicating the scope, step* 3 *Outlining the structure and step* 4 *Presenting the aims.* As the names suggest step 1 may deal with announcing the theme, step 2 with talking in general about the scope of the lecture, step 3 may provide the plan of the presentation and step 4 would give goals of the lecture. Lee (ibid) noted that these three steps in move 2 are messier, are not always in a 'linear sequence' and are often sequenced in reverse order. The author of the present research agrees with this observation through the personal notice of lecture sequencing. Aims (step 4) may be presented before the outline of the structure (step 3) or indicating the scope (step 2). Sometimes lecturers skip some steps from move 2, for example, *Outlining the structure*.

Move 3 *Putting the topic* in the context corresponds to the body of the written text, the lecturer prepares students for understanding the new information and activating the existing knowledge, steps of move 3 may also occur in different order and some of them may be even missing, "no sequential pattern is implied by the numbering of the steps" (Lee: ibid: 49). Step 1 as the title suggests aims at proving newsworthiness, importance and necessity of the lecture topic pertaining to the course, using the step 2 the lecturer relates the given new theme to the old theme of the present lecture or the previous lecture or relating the currently-described topic to the future theme, step 3 is often used to connect the new information to the previously acquired information.

The author of the present research was interested in analyzing the structure of the whole lecture, including its introductory part, main text and conclusion, however, since she did not discover any researches of move structure on the whole lecture she decided to work out her own model on the basis of Lee's model and taking into consideration Cheng's strategies in lecture closings (2012), where the researcher took a corpus-based approach to the closings of academic lectures. Cheng distinguished three main rhetorical stages of lecture closings including 15 strategies that were categorized into 12 Teacher Strategies (for example, indicating the end of lecture, asking if students have questions, calling for attention and others) and three Student Strategies (raising questions about course-related issues, raising questions about lecture content and responding to the lecturer). The author of the present research was interested mainly in the discourse of the lecturer that is why she considered only Cheng's Teacher Strategies and ignored Student Strategies, the rest of Cheng's strategies were grouped into four steps*: Referring to the audience, Looking ahead, Housekeeping, Summarizing the content and concluding the lecture.*

The move analysis of seven randomly chosen randomly chosen soft science lectures was done – three of them – lectures recorded in Saint Petersburg State University of Economics and transcribed by the author and four downloaded from YouTube – one from Saïd Business School of the University of Oxford and three from Yale Courses that are available for free access online. The idea was to look at the typical structure of a lecture. To attain this purpose the author based her model on the three-move model of

Lee and added an additional Move 4 that she called Concluding the lecture, the function of which is to indicate the end of a lecture or to come to a conclusion of lecture content. So the structure looked as follows:

Table 5 Move Structure of Lectures Suggested by Lee (2009) with Move 4 Added by the Author

Move 1: Warming up
- Step 1: Making a digression
- Step 2: Housekeeping
- Step 3: Looking ahead

Move 2: Setting up the lecture framework
- Step 1: Announcing the topic
- Step 2: Indicating the scope
- Step 3: Outlining the structure
- Step 4: Presenting the aims

Move 3: Putting the topic in context
- Step 1: Showing the importance of the topic
- Step 2: Relating "new" to "given"
- Step 3: Referring to earlier lectures

Move 4: Concluding the lecture
- Step 1: Referring to the audience
- Step 2: Looking ahead
- Step 3: Housekeeping
- Step 4: Summarizing the content and concluding the lecture

The table below demonstrates four moves of an academic lecture structure, communicative functions of the moves and is exemplified with the extracts from 7 authentic academic lectures.

Move/ Step	Name	Communicative Function	University Lecture Extracts (Recorded in SPBGUE and Downloaded from Free Internet Resources)
Move 1	**Warming up**		**An introduction to the forthcoming lecture**
Step 1	Making a digression (*)	General course information and course-related asides (e.g., assignments or class hours)	*Lecture 2* [Good morning, everyone. Today we start our course on development of marketing and services. Ok? So, as you already know [pause] we will have classes throughout the week [pause], six days, four hours a day. [pause] Ahh, and, well, my name is A…G…, I hope you have noticed it yet, I am from Spain…and I was actually, I was I was born in this city (points at the slide)] *Lecture 5* [On the 11th of November you will give a short presentation… you can think about it in the beginning of the course… from 12 to 15 minutes… you can present it as a group. First of all, you are welcome to give any topic… you think it will be interesting for others… I won't limit you… you are welcome to present it… I have a suggestion of course.]
Step 2	Housekeeping (*)	Information about organizational issues; Explaining non-course-related matters	*Lecture 5* [As you know we will be studying just for a week, not longer and there will be one class on the 10th of November, which will be a visit to the museum. Did you get it already? Did you get this understanding? So, on the 10th of November our International Department will take you to the museum which is called Grand Maket Russia. If you visited it already, that's fine, just tell the international department …]
Step 3	Looking ahead (*)	Indicating the plan for the future (e.g., course content or activities for the next class)	*Lecture 1* [All right. Let's start. So, as I already told you the second part of the session will be a practical case. This is again as you already know is going to be for at least on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.]
Move 2	**Setting up the lecture framework**		**Introduction of the topic of the lecture**
Step 1	Announcing the topic	Announcing the theme	*Lecture 2* [So, what I usually do when I start my courses, no matter which course I am teaching, the first class is what I call "the background". The background isn't related directly to service development, but it's a background… it is common to every single course, every single field. And this background…ah…it consists of three things. Ok? People, economy and technology. So, I will go to them, again that at the micro level. So I always need this information, because I think it's important. For later on. Because you will be developing services in my course and you need to keep this in mind. Ok? By the way, my all courses are all about interaction. And I really don't enjoy, you know talking for one hour and a half. I bet you don't enjoy this either, so I am hoping to have a discussion in all my classes.] *Lecture 4* [This is Financial Markets, and I'm Robert Shiller. This is a course for undergraduates. It doesn't presume any prerequisites except the basic Intro Econ [Introductory Economics] prerequisite. It's about --well, the title of the course is Financial Markets.
Step 2	Indicating the scope	Talking in general about the scope of the lecture	*Lecture 4* [By putting "markets" in the title of the course, I'm trying to indicate that it's down to earth, it's about the real world, and, well, to me it connotes that this is about what we do with our lives. It's about our society. So, you might imagine it's a course about trading since it says "markets," but it's more general than that. Finance, I believe, is, as it says in the course description, a pillar of civilized society. It's the structure through which we do things, at least on a large scale of things. It's about allocating resources through space and time, our limited resources that we have in our world. It's about incentivizing people to do productive things. It's about sponsoring ventures that bring together a lot of people and making sure that people are fairly treated, that they contribute constructively and that they get a return for doing that. And it's about managing risks, that anything that we do in life is uncertain. Anything big or important that we do is uncertain. And to me that's what financial markets is about. To me, this is a course that will have a philosophical underpinning, but at the same time will be very focused on details.]
Step 3	Outlining the structure	Providing the plan of the presentation	Have not noticed it at any lecture

Move 3	**Putting the topic in context**	**Preparing students for understanding the new information and activating the existing knowledge**	
Step 1	Showing the importance of the topic	Showing newsworthiness, importance and necessity of the lecture topic pertaining to the course.	*Lecture 2* [So, I have the map of the world in here and I would like to ask you at the very general level to look at the trends happening in the world at the moment. And I am talking about really big macro trends. What's going on in the world? Which things are happening in the world in the really general level?]
Step 2	Relating "new" to "given"	Relating the given new theme to the old theme of the present lecture to the previous lecture	*Lecture 1* [Hello. Have you read the case/ I was at the meeting today of our department. … we should discuss the case… so, you have this story at facebook and you have this story, printed story… Please tell me who has read the story… Ok, so very good we have already discussed with you … **so we are talking about** the strategy… let's start…] *Lecture 7* […it is what we talked about in the first couple of our sessions together especially in the discussion about jobs to be done is a big difference between understanding for this correlated with the outcome versus what causes it and at this point we just have correlation …but if it's a strong or robust correlation then you'll take that in go back and look at other phenomena and you can predict if this is a good correlation what you're gonna see and if in fact you see what you predicted you'd see you might feel good as a researcher but if you leave what you're trying to do …]
Step 3	Referring to earlier lectures	Connecting the new information to the previously acquired information	*Lecture 7* [Right good evening everybody. It's a pleasure on behalf of this business school to welcome Clayton Christensen to his third lecture … yesterday he talked to introduce the concept to the pandas thumb in organizations …evolutionally hangovers whose purpose was completely forgotten and I thought of Oxford University and some of those features he talked about that in each lecture he's been provocative stimulating and fun and that's final lecture …] *Lecture 3* [Hello. You are very kind to come back for the second time. Am… Today I think it will be a different part than last night…. I thought about last night staff a lot…, a part of the [charter] here for me is to give a talk that I haven't given before I've written about. And… so these are the thoughts that I have made and …I would love to have you listen to it mmm and when we have discussing toward the end …have you been able criticize my thinking or …reinforce my thinking if you think that there is something here that is useful…]
Move 4	**Concluding the lecture**	**Indicating the end of a lecture / Coming to a conclusion of lecture content**	
Step 1	Referring to the audience	Asking if students have questions; Answering students' questions; Calling for attention; Raising questions or issues for discussion.	*Lecture 2* [So, it will be important if you raise your hand and I'll tell you, please do talk, if you say your name out loud. So, it helps me remember it.]
Step 2	Looking ahead (*)	Indicating the plan for the future (e.g., course content or activities for the next class).	*Lecture 6* [There's an interesting book by Robert Frank, I don't have it on the reading list, called Richistan, who talks about what wealthy people are like these days. And if you read his book sometimes they are disgustingly rich and spending the money on silly things. But there is an idea among many of them that they are going to do their good things for the world. Because I think many of you will do these things, I want to think about the purpose that you'll find in finance. So, that's just the closing thought. I'll see you again on Wednesday. But the closing thought is that this is about making your purposes happen. OK.]
Step 3	Housekeeping (*)	Information about organizational issues, Explaining non-course-related matters.	*Lecture 5* [As you know we will be studying just for a week, not longer and there will be one class on t he 10th of November, which will be a visit to the museum. Did you get it already? Did you get this understanding? So, on the 10th of November our International Department will take you to the museum which is called Grand Maket Russia. If you visited it already, that's fine, just tell the international department …]

Step 4	Summarizing the content and concluding the lecture	Summarizing the content of a lecture; Summarizing or reviewing key points; Indicating the end of a lecture; Coming to a conclusion of lecture content.	*Lecture 4* [Let me just recap. The two themes are that independence leads to the law of large numbers, and it leads to some sort of stability. Either independence through time or independence across stocks. So, if you diversify through time or you diversify across stocks, you're supposed to be safe. But that's not what happened in this crisis and that's the big question. And then it's fat-tails, which is kind of related. But it's that distributions fool you. You get big incredible shocks that you thought couldn't happen, and they just come up with a certain low probability, but with a certain regularity in finance.] Lecture 3 [And nobody decided that we should live life this way, but just it happens to us and we need to be more conscious about it. Anyway, the other two are even worse (the audience is laughing), but we can talk about that another time. If I can go down here and if you guys have questions can you throw that on me (applauses).]

*This step may occur throughout the lecture in different moves.
Table 6 Move Structure Analysis of the Academic Lectures

Lecture 1 Corporate Social Responsibility, November 11, 2015, SPBGUE, Saint-Petersburg
Lecture 2 Development of Marketing and Services, October 19, 2015, SPBGUE, Saint-Petersburg
Lecture 3 Lectures on Management - Clarendon Lectures, June 11, 2013, Saïd Business School, University of Oxford
Lecture 4 Financial Crisis of 2007-2008 and Its Connection to Probability Theory, April, 2011, Financial Markets, 2011, Yale Courses, Free Internet Access
Lecture 5 Russian Civilization, November 2, 2015 SPBGUE, Saint-Petersburg
Lecture 6 Introduction and What this Course Will Do for You and Your Purposes, Financial Markets (2011) (ECON 252), Yale Courses, Free Internet Access
Lecture 7 Lectures about the Process of Research - Clarendon Lectures 12th June 2013, Yale Courses, Free Internet Access

ISSN 2453-7101

Having analyzed structure of seven lectures at their macro level, the author has noticed that the Concluding phase – Move 4 includes steps that may recur in other moves, for example, *Looking ahead and Housekeeping*, id est, the lecturer may indicate the plan for the future (Step 2) in the beginning, middle and at the end of the lecture and it will sound coherent and will not disturb the structure of the lecture, as well as explanation of non-course-related matters (Step 3) may occur in any part of the lecture, whereas, Step 4 that includes *Summarizing the content of a lecture; Summarizing or reviewing key points; Indicating the end of a lecture and Coming to a conclusion of* lecture content may appear only at the final phase of the lecture, and never in the beginning or in the middle that is why it is logical that the move structure of the lecture has to consist of four moves, including not only Warming up, Setting up the lecture framework and Putting the topic in context, but Concluding the lecture too.

Another possibility to investigate the structure of an academic lecture is to look at the six phases proposed by the representative of SFL school of genre studies - Young (1994) who did a research of a corpus of lectures, divided them into two phases (metadiscoursal and non-metadiscoursal) and identified six recurring lecture 'phases' based on language choices: *Discourse structuring, Conclusion, Evaluation, Interaction, Content and Example phases*. They have been developed on the basis of three situational functions (ideational, interpersonal and textual) that have been influenced by Halliday's (2000) situational factors of field, tenor and mode.

- Discourse structuring phase – aims at indicating the way, direction that a lecture is going to take. This phase recurs frequently throughout the lecture, a lecturer indicates to listeners new directions of a lecture.
- Conclusion phase – the lecturer summarizes points that he has done throughout the discourse. As Wu (2013) pointed out "the frequency of this phase is determined by the number of new points made in any particular discourse";
- Evaluation phase – evaluation of material; the lecturer reinforces each of the moves by evaluation the information that is transmitted. Lecturers realize it by showing the listeners their personal agreement or disagreement;
- Interaction phase – lecturers maintain the contact with the audience. This is realized through the dialogue with the listeners (students), questions and pauses;
- Content phase – reflects lecture's purpose and transmits theoretical information. "In this phase theories, models, and definitions are presented to the listeners" (Wu, 2013);
- Example phase – explains theoretical concepts through concrete examples, familiar to students.

Flowerdew (1994) analyzed the academic discourse and has concluded on the basis of findings of Murphy and Candlin (1977) that although lectures are basically monologues in comparison to school lessons, they do have a number of interactive acts that are characteristic to the latter. The terminology used by Flowerdew (ibid) includes:

- *marker / discourse marker* (language elements used to move from one theme to another or from one part of discourse to another), e.g., well, right, now;
- *starter* (lexical-grammatical elements used to initiate, start the theme) e.g. Let*'s move to … Let's begin with…*
- *informative* (explanation or definition provided by a lecturer), e.g. Individualism is characterized by interests of an individual put higher than collective interests;
- *aside* (words spoken so as not to be heard by others present), e.g. "running out of blackboard here" (Flowerdew: ibid.);
- *metastatement* (a statement giving information about another statement);
- *conclusion* (end of an idea, thought or theme summarized by the speaker).

All these interactive features can be encountered in the course of the academic discourse within the genre of an academic lecture. They assist students in lecture processing.

The lecture "remains the central instructional activity" (Flowerdew, 1994). Academic lecture discourse is a complex speech process, which involves communication rather than reading a text. The lecturer as an addressor encodes the information which is passed on to the student who is an addressee. In the course of a lecture, subject teachers provide output of their theoretical and practical knowledge, use specialized lexicon and professional jargon, demonstrate their ability to construct sentences, show attitude to the theme, express their point of view, argue, summarize and conclude.

Karpińska-Musiał (2009) enumerates the following features of a lecture which remain prone to contextual differentiation: linguistic etiquette, audience reactions, length of speech, physical environment, type of a lecture hall/room, level of stress, modesty topos and its adequate application, style of delivery (spoken/read/presentation/using notes), eye-management, non-verbal behaviour, paralinguistic features of language (tone of voice, loudness, pitch, pace, pausing and timing, clear articulation). Cicero used to claim that the top skill of an orator is to *inflame the soul of the hearer*.

The academic lecture delivered in the English language is likely to develop students' micro and macro skills of the target language. The style of lecture chosen by a lecturer is dependent on the purpose, subject, theme, knowledge of students and their schemata. A lecturer chooses and applies the style which is the most appropriate to the conditions of time, the number of listeners, and subject area. The taxonomy of **micro and macro-skills** worked out by Richards (1983) defines the skills that are important for successful academic listening comprehension by students. Meanwhile, the quality of listening and understanding lectures by a student depends on the lecturers' skills to deliver information. It is self-evident that the speech of a lecturer should be coherent, precise,

logically organized, and cohesive. Subject teachers' macro-skills are of essential significance, too. They comprise how speakers structure their lectures, whether the lecture discourse is effective for students' comprehension and encoding.

A contemporary academic lecture by its constituency differs much from what it was several decades ago. The former lectures were conducted more in the form of a 'reading style' (Dudley-Evans and Johns, 1994), where a lecturer was reading a lecture from the notes previously prepared at home or delivering it as if reading, whereas students had a more passive role in taking notes, interrupting a lecturer from time to time in order to clarify concepts and to check understanding. The studies on lectures styles done before Dudley-Evans and Johns included Goffman's and Bereday's classifications. There was the use of 'talk-and-chalk style' (Bereday in Mason, 1983) which was characterized by lecturer's delivering the material with the accompanied use of blackboard. Again, students were mainly involved in organizing information in the way of note-taking. Goffman (1981) distinguished three modes of lectures – 'memorization', 'aloud reading' and 'fresh talk'. 'Memorization' applies to a lecturing style where a lecturer does not read his/her script, but follows it closely and, thus, it is almost identical to 'aloud reading'. 'Fresh talk' may be characterized by free speech of a lecturer on the topic with the use of notes. Frederic (1986) refers to a 'participatory lecture', which is close to a discussion. Morrison (in Jordan, 1989), studied science lectures and divided them into two kinds: formal and informal, where the formal style was "close to spoken prose", whereas the informal one was "high in informational content, but not necessarily in high formal register".

With the advance of modern technologies and extensive use of Power Point, in which a lecturer structures his speech according to the logical plan of his presentation in slides, several other characteristics of lectures should be mentioned. The most important shift in the lecture is that today it is not a purely spoken discourse. By being accompanied with text from slides on the screen, lectures have 'multi-faceted nature' (Swales,1995 in Camiciottoli, 2007), where on the one hand they serve the function of the 'transmission and dissemination of knowledge' with the use of all professional terminology and concepts (Merlini (1983) in Camiciotolli, 2007), which is more characteristic of written genres of academic writings and, on the other hand, we can find a lot from dialogic devices, for instance, metadiscursive expressions, imperatives, argumentative sequences. Bakhtin (1986) attributes lectures to a 'secondary speech genre' which is described as the sphere of communication that is relatively formal and culturally-organized. Another important characteristic of a modern lecture is its interactiveness, which means that a modern lecture happens in a way of a conversation with the involvement of students in the discussion of the theme. According to Benson (in Camiciotolli, 2007), they are becoming less formal and more interactive with the role of the lecturer as more of a 'facilitator' and a 'guide' with "open style" lecturing which allows for better comprehension. If a lecturer provides students with handouts of

his presentation, the role of note-taking decreases, since students are more preoccupied with following the speaker rather than writing notes on his speech. Both the complex nature of the lecture and the interactive approach may be a cause of difficulty for non-native English speaking students who study in English. The fact that students possess ready-made handouts can also have a dubious effect of correct notes made by a lecturer and lack of personal notes that are an integral part of the study process since they foster memorization and improve studies. Consequently, one of the tasks of the research was to distinguish what lecturing styles are mostly preferred by students and what lecturing styles academic personnel choose in the course of their work.

Conclusion

The present article investigated Genre theories and the nature of a university (academic) lecture as a separate spoken pedagogical genre with its specific features. It was concluded that lecture is an example of a secondary spoken genre with social exigence, speech will or social purpose to provide new information by a lecturer to a group of students.

Using the findings of Systemic Functional Linguistics, lecture is a social, goal-oriented and staged activity with a logical plan (stages), composed and realized by the lecturer. In the course of a lecture using specific linguistic features lecturers may fulfill different functions and purposes. Swales's concepts of the communicative event, purpose and discourse community are applicable to the context of the university lecture, making academia, that is lecturers and students, belong to the same discourse community that shares common goals and uses a common language. Bhatia's and van Dijk's views on the discourse genre are applicable to conducting of analysis in academic and professional settings.

The analysis of concepts of genre, register, discourse and style has helped in clarifying the terminology, placing discourse on top of hierarchy as the most general term. It is followed by the concept of genre related to a particular context of culture, where genre uses specific register, and style.

The lecture is characterized by 'involvement' and 'detachment' of lecturers reflecting their emotional participation. It is an 'interactive', 'contextual', 'situational' and to some extent 'improvising' activity of a highly dynamic nature. It is a changing genre which has transformed from a one-way lecture speech imparting knowledge to a more interactive and constructive style. It is an example of 'genre mixing' – a combination of spoken and written registers, use of modern technologies with the hybrid nature of seminars, lectures, conference presentations and written research articles.

The lecture has 'intertextual' characteristics – lecturer's text / discourse is usually based on previously created texts and quotations of other authors. A modern lecture has features of 'interdisciplinarity', comprising a combination of diverse sciences and disciplines.

The researcher investigated different ways of the analysis of the macro-structure of the academic lecture and has developed a four – stage model that comprises moves, including 1. warming up, 2. setting up the lecture framework, 3. putting the topic in context and 4. concluding the lecture. The analysis of 7 authentic academic lectures showed that some moves and steps may recur and repeat, although, as a rule, a well-structured university lecture follows the model where all four stages are present and follow one another.

The style of a lecture is dependent on the purpose, subject, theme and knowledge of students and can vary from 'reading', 'talk-and-chalk', 'fresh talk', 'memorization', 'aloud reading' to 'participatory' styles.

The current investigation was limited by a small number of lectures visited and analyzed, therefore it is recommended that further research be undertaken.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported in part by a grant from Erasmus Mundus, Aurora 2 – Towards Modern and Innovative Higher Education.

References

Al-Jubouri, A. J. R. (1976). *Concurrent Validity of Three EFL Tests of Reading Comprehension.* (Unpublished M. A. thesis). Leeds University, London, England

Artemeva, N., Freedman.A. ed. (2008). *Rhetorical Genre Studies and Beyond*. Inkshed Publications, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Athanasiou, T. (2010). *Key Topics in Surgical Research and Methodology*, Berlin, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Retrieved from http://www.reproline.jhu.edu/english/6read/6training/lecture/sp605web.pdf

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin, Tx: University of Texas Press.

Bawarshi, A.S. and Mary Jo Reif, M.J. (2010). *Genre An Introduction to History, Theory, Research, and Pedagogy*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press

Beard R &, Hartley, J. (1984). *Teaching and Learning Higher Education.*London: Hatper and Row.

Bhatia, V.K., Flowerdew, J. & Jones, R. H. (2008). *Advances in Discourse Studies*. Oxon: Routledge

Bhatia, V.K. (2013). *Analysing Genre Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group

Biber, D., Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, Cambridge

Biber, D. and E. Finegan. (1989). '*Styles of Stance in English: Lexical and Grammatical Marking of Evidentiality and Affect*.' Text 9/1: 93–124.

Bligh, D. A. (1972). *What's the Use of Lectures?* Middlesex: Harrnondswonh.

Bligh, D. A. (1980). *Methods and Techniques in Post-Secondary Education*. Exeter: Bligh Publ. Co.

Bligh, D.A. (2000). *What is the Use of Lectures*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco

Cameron,B. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse*. Sage Publications, London

Carman, R. A., & Adams, W. R. (1972). *Study Skills: A Student's Guide for Survival*. New York, NY: John Wiley &SonsCarter and Van Matre

Chafe, W. (1982). '*Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature' in D. Tannen (ed.): Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy*. Ablex.

Chambers, E., & Northedge, A. (1997). *The Arts Good Study Guide*. London, England: The Open University.

Christie, F. (2004). Systemic Functional Linguistics and a Theory of Language in Education. Systemic Functional Linguistics in Action. *A Special Edition of the Journal of English Language, Literatures in English and Cultural Studies*, 13–40.

Davis, B.G (1993). *Tools for Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ferguson, N. (1973). Some Aspects of the Reading Process. *ELT Journal*, 28, 63–86. DOI: 10.1093/elt/XXVIII.1.29Field (1998)

Flowerdew, J. (1992). *Definitions in Science Lectures*. *Applied Linguistics*, *13*, 201-221.

Flowerdew, J. (1994). *Research of Relevance to Second Language Lecture Comprehension Academic listening: Research Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, pages: 7-29

Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in English Language Education*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, London and New York

Flowerdew, J. (2015). "John Swales's Approach to Pedagogy in Genre Analysis: a Perspective from 25 Years on". *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, March 2015, Available from: John Flowerdew, Retrieved on: 06 February 2016

Freedman, A, & Medway (1994). ed. *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis

Friesen, N. (2001). The Lecture as Transmedial Pedagogical Form: A Historical Analsyis. *Educational Researcher, 40* (3), 95-102

Gibbs, G. (1981). *Teaching Students to Learn*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Heaton, J. B. (1975). *Studying in English*. London, England: Longman Group.Holes (1972)

Young, L. (1990). *Language as Behavior, Language as Code: a Study of Academic English*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Karpińska-Musiał (2009). *Revising Academic Discourse - Intercultural Rhetorical Competence of a Lecturer in Postmodern Europe*. Retrieved from http://www.uni-

saarland.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Info/Europa/institute/eir/Proceedings/Paper_Karpi%C5%84ska-Musia%C5%82_Beata.pdf
Konnikova, M. (2014). What's Lost as Handwriting Fades. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/03/science/whats-lost-as-handwriting-fades.html
Lee, J. J. (2009). Size matters: an exploratory comparison of small- and large-class university lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purpose, 28*(1), 42 57.
Marshall, L., & Rowland, F. (1998). *A Guide to Learning Independently* (3rd ed.). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
Miller, L. (2002). Towards a Model for Lecturing in a Second Language. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 145-162
Murray R (1992). Faraday's Advice to the Lecturer. *Anal Chem* 64:131
Nørgaard,N., Montoro , R. & Busse, B. (2010). *Key Terms in Stylistics*. London: Continuum
Nunan, D. (2008). Exploring Genre and Register in Contemporary English. *English Today*, 24, pp 56-61 doi:10.1017/S0266078408000217
Richards (1983). Listening Comprehension: Approach, Design and Procedure. *TESOL Quarterly*, 219 – 240
Rost, M. (1990). *Listening in Language Learning: Applied Linguistics and Language Study*. London, England: Longman.
Rost, M. (2005). L2 Listening. *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates, 503-528.
Russel (2015). Genre as Social Action: A Gaze into Phenomenology, *Composition Forum (31),* Spring 2015 Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1061590.pdf
Sullivan, R.L. (1996). *Delivering effective lectures. JHPIEGOStrategy Paper#5*. US Agency for International Development
Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Setting.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Swales, J.M. (2004). *Research Genres: Explorations and Application*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Swales, J.M. (2009). *Worlds of Genre — Metaphors of Genre, in Genre in a Changing World, ed. by Bazerman, C., Bonini, A. and Figueiredo, D.* (2009), West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press, pp. 3-17

Contact

Valerija Malavska
Turiba University, University of Latvia
Lokomotives 48, 113, Riga, Latvia, LV-1057
valerija.malavska@turiba.lv