# Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World

Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Purposes, 8-10 July 2013, Vienna, Austria

# Teacher performance in university lectures: A contrastive analysis of L1 and L2 discourse

Marina Tzoannopoulou

# Teacher performance in university lectures: A contrastive analysis of L1 and L2 discourse

Marina Tzoannopoulou

*School of Journalism & Mass Communications, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki*
Greece

*Correspondence to:* marijo@jour.auth.gr

**Abstract.** This paper focuses on a research study into Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at the tertiary level, in Greece and it aims to examine the organizational and linguistic features of lectures. A contrastive analysis of six lectures on similar topics delivered by the same university teachers in their L1 (Greek) and L2 (English) was carried in order to determine similarities and differences in their academic discourse between the L1 and L2 and to assess their implications for teacher training. The design of the research uses qualitative methods and it draws on systemic functional linguistics and, more specifically, on the notions of genre and phase. Analysis of the data reveals that the Greek lectures exhibit a clearer organizational structure, a higher use of conclusion markers and a wider range of stylistic choices. The findings suggest that there is a need for language-oriented teacher training in CLIL university settings.

**Keywords.** Academic lectures, CLIL, discourse analysis, phases, teacher training, tertiary education.

## 1. Introduction

The past decade has witnessed some profound changes in European higher education following the Bologna agreement which aimed at standardizing the higher education systems of the 45 signatory countries (Benelux Bologna secretariat 2007-2010). This 'harmonization' has led to an increased mobility of students and academic staff which had as a consequence the growing implementation of English-taught programmes within the European higher education area (Wächter & Maiworm 2008). Although learning through a foreign language in university contexts is hardly new (Wilkinson 2004), what is novel is the large applicability of Content and Language Integrated programmes (CLIL) which offer a combined learning approach of subject matter and foreign language (Coyle, Hood and Marsh 2010).

Focusing on the Greek educational setting, the implementation of CLIL is still scant with hardly any institutional provision (Eurydice 2006). In particular, while some empirical research is conducted in primary and secondary levels, to our knowledge, very little has been carried out in the tertiary context. This study focuses on the contrastive analysis of the organizational and linguistic features of lectures. More specifically, the analysis will identify macro and micro levels of discourse used by content Greek teachers in the delivery of lectures in Greek (L1) and English (L2), and also, will pinpoint the similarities and differences in their discourse. The ultimate purpose of the study is to offer specific language objectives for CLIL teacher training.

For the analysis of the data the present study follows Young's model of phasal analysis (Young 1994) which is based on Systemic Functional Linguistics, SFL (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004) and genre analysis (Eggins 1994, Martin 1997). In a general sense SFL "seeks to explain the nature of language by examining the ways it is used to transmit experiences, feelings and attitudes, because it views language as part of a social system" (Halliday, in Young 1990: 3). From a functional perspective speakers make linguistic choices based on the context of the situation. This model has been proven useful in classroom settings as it highlights the role of language in the construction of knowledge. By using a SLF framework one can look into the way language is used and the way it is structured for use. Both these issues can be investigated with the use of genre analysis. Genre can be viewed as a staged, goal-oriented, social process (Martin 1997). Bhatia (1993: 16) points out that "each genre is an instance of a successful achievement of a

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**314**

specific communicative purpose using conventionalized knowledge of linguistic and discoursal resources". In general, SFL pays specific attention to language choices and the way these choices indicate the boundaries between the different stages and the functions of each stage.

Genre analysis treats lectures as a type of educational genre (Eggins 1994). Young (1994: 164-165), in a study on the structure of seven academic lectures from a variety of disciplines, made the observation that rather than having just a beginning, a middle and a conclusion, lectures should be seen as a series of interweaving 'phases'. Phases are defined as "strands of discourse that recur discontinuously throughout a particular language event, and taken together, structure the event". Put differently, "phasal analysis suggests that there are many beginnings, many middles and many ends" in a lecture (*ibid.*). Young points to the consistency of this phasal structure across different scientific domains and stresses that it characterizes both native and non-native spoken academic discourse. According to phasal analysis the macrostructure of university lectures consists of six types of phases, grouped into two broad categories: metadiscoursal phases which comment on the discourse itself and non-metadiscoursal phases which refer to the actual content of the lectures. The first group includes the *discourse structuring phase*, in which lecturers indicate the directions they will take in their lecture (including devices such as "first", "second", or "another issue"), the *conclusion phase*, in which the speakers summarize the main points made in the discourse (including markers such as "so, this is an example of" or "in conclusion"), and the *evaluation phase*, where the speakers evaluate the information transmitted to the audience (including devices such as "it is important" or "very interesting"). The second group includes the *interaction phase* in which the speakers maintain contact with the audience and ensure the content of the lecture is understood, the *theory or content phase* where theories, definitions and models are presented and, finally, the *exemplification phase* where theoretical concepts are explained through the use of concrete examples.

The importance of discourse markers in the successful delivery and comprehension of lectures has been pointed out by previous research. Chaudron and Richards (1986: 123) in an analysis of the effect of discourse markers on L2 lecture comprehension revealed that students were able to recall better the main points of a lecture when the lecturer used mainly macro-markers, that is, "discourse signals of the relationship between successive episodes and moves within the lecture" rather than using macro and micro-markers, that is devices which indicate links between sentences or functioning as fillers. Chaudron and Richards reached the conclusion that the former are mainly useful in following primary information while the latter assist only lower levels of information. Taking a different perspective other studies have focused on the relationship between the comprehension process and lecturing styles (Dudley-Evans 1994; Flowerdew 1994; Crawford Camiciottoli 2005). More recently, Dafouz Milne & Núñez-Perucha (2010: 213) made a contrastive analysis of lectures given in Spanish (L1) and English (L2) by the same speakers and reached the conclusion that "the Spanish data show more explicit signalling, a wider variety of stylistic choices, and a higher use of interaction devices and conclusion markers".

## 2. The study

The data of this study is based on the transcriptions of six university lectures (around one hour each, 45,000 words in total) delivered by the same teachers in Greek and English. The lecturers, two males and one female are native speakers of Greek and permanent academic staff at the School of Journalism and Mass Communications (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki). As self-reported in an interview following the lectures their levels of English ranged between high intermediate and advanced and all of them had previous experience in lecturing in the foreign language. In Greece, as in other European countries, university teachers specialize in a particular discipline in which they usually research and teach. Lecturers usually achieve a good standard in English through education abroad or personal experiences and interest. The lectures delivered in English were part of the International Programme offered by the School of Journalism during the spring semester 2013. The International Programme offers 16 courses in English and it aims to

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**315**

help Erasmus students become more internationally minded, by offering a better understanding of mediated communication in all its forms and by developing the productive, socially responsible, and creative role of its graduates in the various sectors of public communication and information on an international basis.

Twelve international students from various countries of the European Union (Spain, Germany, Poland, Sweden and the Netherlands) attended the programme which focuses on the areas of journalism, mass media, and communication. Their level of proficiency satisfies the B2 CEFR level, an official requirement by the School.

The lectures given in Greek were part of the official degree in Journalism and Mass Communications and were recorded during the same semester. The audience of these lectures was on average 30 students per group, all native speakers of Greek. The lectures cover similar topics in order to ensure homogenization of the material in both languages. Each lecture was audio recorded by means of a small pocket-sized digital recorder. Structured observations were conducted for all six lectures. Extra care was taken in order for the observations to be as unobtrusive as possible with the researcher taking field notes during the period of lecturing. One-to-one semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the students, following the lectures, were conducted with the use of a protocol based on a set of prepared questions and a set of open ones. This type of instrument is considered to be appropriate for gaining insight into the participants' behaviour and also allows for spontaneity (Dörnyei, 2007). It included open questions, probes (clarification questions) and questions on key topics. The interviews with the lecturers were conducted in Greek, the teachers' native language.

## 3. Methodology

The lectures were transcribed following the use of Gail Jefferson's system (2004). Phases were coded according to the following system (Tab. 1), the codes marking the beginning and end of each phase:

| Discourse structuring phase <DS> |
| --- |
| Evaluation phase <E> |
| Conclusion phase <C> |

Table 1. Coding system

The present analysis is based on Young's theory of phasal analysis (1994) and it partly follows the taxonomy of metadiscourse categories and functions proposed by Dafouz Milne & Núñez-Perucha (2010). This classification of metadiscourse is based on two sources: The first one draws on the distinction between textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers (e.g. Hyland 2005). Textual markers organize discourse and make it coherent and convincing while interpersonal markers allow speakers/writers to express their perspective towards their propositions and their audience. The second source focuses on the relationship and interdependence between macro-elements (phases) and metadiscursive devices or MDs, that is, "micro-linguistic devices used to signal a particular phase" (Dafouz Milne & Núñez Perucha 2010: 219).

## 4. Findings and Discussion

The analysis of the data reveals that the three lecturers use more metadiscursive devices when lecturing in their L1. The discourse structuring phase stands out as the most frequent type of phase in both sets of data (Tab. 2). In the following sections we focus on the types of markers used in each phase and we highlight the similarities and differences in their uses in both the L1 and L2.

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**316**

| | | Lecturer 1 | Lecturer 2 | Lecturer 3 | Totals (n) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Discourse structuring | L1 (Greek) | 36 | 30 | 24 | 90 |
| <DS> | L2 (English) | 25 | 20 | 21 | 66 |
| Evaluation | L1 (Greek) | 23 | 25 | 18 | 66 |
| <E> | L2 (English) | 15 | 15 | 8 | 38 |
| Conclusion | L1 (Greek) | 10 | 9 | 8 | 27 |
| <C> | L2 (English) | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |

Table 2. Number of phases in teachers' discourse in L1 and L2

### 4.1. Discourse structuring phase

The types of markers used in this phase are quite similar in both sets of data except for a higher use of topicalisers (marking the introduction of a new topic) in Greek (Tab.3).

| <DS> | | Lecturer 1 | Lecturer 2 | Lecturer 3 | Totals (n) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Openers | L1 (Greek) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| <DS-O> | L2 (English) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Sequencers | L1 (Greek) | 3 | 6 | 4 | 13 |
| <DS-S> | L2 (English) | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 |
| Prospectives | L1 (Greek) | 7 | 3 | 6 | 16 |
| <DS-P> | L2 (English) | 5 | 3 | 5 | 13 |
| Retrospectives | L1 (Greek) | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| <DS-R> | L2 (English) | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Topicalisers | L1 (Greek) | 22 | 18 | 10 | 50 |
| <DS-T> | L2 (English) | 14 | 10 | 12 | 36 |

Table 3. Discourse structuring markers

With relation to the different <DS> subtypes identified, openers seem to take the same form and function in the Greek and English lectures. In particular, lecturers use openers at the beginning of the sessions in order to make an explicit opening of the lecture and to provide the content of the lesson. The symbol (.) marks a brief pause.

(1)  <DS-O> **Hallo** everyone (.) so let's begin now (.)  let's see (.) a brief history of Greek TV (.) we'll talk about the  origins the milestone years programmes and time zones <DS-O>

(2)  <DS-O> **Καλημέρα** σήμερα θα μιλήσουμε για τους διεθνείς οργανισμούς <DS-O>

[Good morning today we will talk about international organizations]

The next subtype, sequencers, is realized in a variety of ways marking the direction of the lecture with metadiscursive devices. Temporal markers are evident in both sets of data, such as "first of all" "secondly", "πρώτον" (first), "δεύτερον" (second), "επίσης" (furthermore). The introduction of a new topic or a topic shift is marked by topicalisers in both corpora. Noun phrases functioning as headings and providing explanation of what is to follow are quite common as in example 3. In addition, a number of presentative devices are to be found in the English data usually under the form "we have":

(3)  <DS-T> **Η G7** (.) Οι επτά πλουσιότερες χώρες του κόσμου (.) Αμερική Αγγλία Γαλλία Ιταλία Γερμανία Ιαπωνία (.) η Ρωσία μπήκε αργότερα οκτώ (.) Καναδάς <DS-T> [ **The G7**  (.)  the seven wealthiest countries in the world  (.)  the United States England France Italy Germany Japan  (.) Russia joined later eight  (.) Kanada]

(4)  <DS-T> **Economic measures** (.) **we have** cuts in salaries and pensions this has to be stopped (.)  **we have** some structural reforms our tax collection system has to be more efficient more transparent (.) **we have** the same with our civil servants <DS-T>

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**317**

Topicalisers can also be found in rhetorical questions, usually in the form of question-answer or question-sequence-answer (example 5). Rhetorical questions are answered by the lecturer who does not pause for a student response as in example 6:

(5)   <DS-T> Now, the ideal would be to see or provide an introduction on two things **what are the characteristics of Greek-French relations**? **is it friendly of hostile?** one is that (.) the other would be to examine let's say the general position of France on how to deal with countries in Europe that create problems <DS-T>

(6)   <DS-T> **Ποιος είναι ο επόμενος οργανισμός που θα εξετάσουμε τώρα**; Η παγκόσμια τράπεζα είναι το επόμενο θέμα <DS-T> [**Which organization   are we going to examine next**? The world bank is the next topic]

Prospective and retrospective markers are also to be found in both sets of the data.  Retrospective markers are mainly realized through the verbal form "remember" to make a reference to information previously imparted by the teachers in the lecture or other lectures (examples 7, 8). Prospective markers, which are found in higher numbers, are mainly articulated through the use of the future tense + adverbial "later" and are used to refer to future topics or parts of the lecture or other lectures (example 9).

(7)   <DS-R> **Θυμάστε** αυτό συνέβη με μεγάλη σφοδρότητα στη Γένοβα το 2001 που σκοτώθηκε και ένας Ιταλός φοιτητής <DS-R> [You remember this happened with great force in Genoa in 2001 where an Italian student was killed]

(8)   <DS-R> You **remember** there are two basic arguments in this text one argument for protectionism where different countries might employ protectionist measures on cultural trade and the other argument is openness <DS-R>

(9)   <DS-P> As **we will see later** this is another argument in favour of protectionism <DS-P>

In the Greek data prospective and retrospective markers make sometimes a joint appearance. For example, we notice the appearance of manner clauses which exhibit past reference, as in "όπως ανέφερα πιο πριν" (as I mentioned earlier), together with the future tense + adverbial "later" (e.g. "αυτό θα το αναλύσουμε πιο κάτω" (we will analyse this later)):

(10)   <DS-R> Ωστόσο, με το πέρασμα του χρόνου η G7 έγινε ολοένα και πιο αναποτελεσματικός μηχανισμός **όπως ανέφερα πιο πριν** <DS-R> γι'αυτό και έχουμε τους G20 <DS-P> αυτό **θα το αναλύσουμε πιο κάτω** <DS-P>  [However the G7 became less and less effective through the years **as I mentioned earlier** and this is why we have the G20 now **we will analyse this later**]

Most DS markers are found at the beginning of lectures but also make sporadic appearances throughout the whole length of the lectures marking the sequences where the lecturer imparts different kinds of information to the audience. A difference between the two sets of data was indentified in the use of topicalisers, especially relating to the level of specificity in the words employed to initiate a phase.  The English corpus includes expressions such as "thing" or "topic", that is, nouns which have generalized reference (Halliday & Hasan 1976) as in example 11, while the Greek data show evidence for items that have more specific reference such as "ερώτημα" ("issue"), "επιχείρημα" ("argument"), or "κριτήριο" ("ctiterion") as in example 12. Such narrower referential items would make the discourse more accurate, enabling the students to understand the lecture in a more effective way, a point also mentioned by Dafouz Milne & Núñez Perucha (2010).

(11)   <DS-T> **So** as to give you some technical **things** <DS-T>

(12)   <DS-T> **Το ερώτημα** διασφαλίζει το ελεύθερο εμπόριο την ειρήνη και την ευημερία; <DST> [**The issue** is here does free trade ensure peace and prosperity?]

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**318**

### 4.2. Evaluation phase

As can be seen from Tab. 4 the Greek data show a higher number of evaluation markers (E), especially in the use of topicalisers and recapitulation markers.

| <E> | | Lecturer 1 | Lecturer 2 | Lecturer 3 | Totals (n) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Topicalisers | L1 (Greek) | 12 | 13 | 9 | 34 |
| <E-T> | L2 (English) | 11 | 9 | 5 | 25 |
| Recapitulation markers <E-R> | L1 (Greek) | 8 | 8 | 6 | 22 |
| | L2 (English) | 2 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
| Prospectives <E-P> | L1 (Greek) | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| | L2 (English) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Retrospectives <E-RT> | L1 (Greek) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| | L2 (English) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Table 4. Evaluation markers

It is interesting to note that the Greek corpus includes a wide variety of attributives which mostly evaluate points already made or act as a reinforcement to the sequences of the conclusion phase by offering judgment on information already passed on to the students. The lecturers tend to use adjectives such as *essential*, *crucial* or *controversial* in the Greek data (examples 13, 14). In the English corpus, however, and especially regarding the use of topicalisers, there seems to be a recurring pattern of repetition of the adjectives ''important'' and ''interesting'' which function as evaluative terms of the new topics introduced by the lecturers as in examples 15 and 16.

(13)  <E-T> Θα μπορούσαμε να πούμε ότι ο Παγκόσμιος Οργανισμός Εμπορίου είναι φαινομενικά πιο δημοκρατικός από το ΔΝΤ και την Παγκόσμια Τράπεζα **είναι ένα ουσιώδες ζήτημα** <E-T> [We could then say that the World Trade Organization is ostensibly more democratic than the IMF and the World Bank **it's an essential issue**]

(14)  <E-T> Παρόλ' αυτά ο Παγκόσμιος Οργανισμός Εμπορίου παραμένει **εξαιρετικά αμφιλεγόμενος** έχει κι' αυτός αποτελέσει τον κύριο στόχο διαμαρτυριών κατά της παγκοσμιοποίησης και του καπιταλισμού <E-T> [The World Trade Organization remains however **extremely controversial** it has also been the main target of protest against globalization and capitalism]

(15)  <E-T> **It is a very important issue to stress here as well** that the regulations of the World Trade Organization were shaped by the interests of the main parties in the negotiations <E-T>

(16)  <E-T> **And another important topic** is time zones  <E-T>

What is worth mentioning here is that the lecturers seem to adopt a more conversational style in their delivery of the English lectures as opposed to a more formal academic one in the Greek sessions.  This could be attributed to the teachers' concern to simplify vocabulary in order to enhance L2 comprehension, a finding also reported by previous research (Crawford Camitiottoli 2005, Dafouz Milne & Núñez Perucha 2010). However, it could be also attributed to the lecturer's difficulties with the foreign language. Despite having self-reported themselves as quite proficient in English and having taught for a number of years in the international programme it is quite probable that they might be facing language difficulties, something that can be corroborated by the interviews that followed. Nevertheless, there seems to be a tendency away from the monological nature of lectures where the teacher acquires an ''authorial expert status'' (Crawford Camiciottoli 2007) to a more interactive lecturing type which may resemble formal discussion or even informal conversation, especially in cases where the teacher uses remarks that digress from the lecture (Morrell, 2004).

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**319**

### 4.3. Conclusion phase

The Greek data show evidence of a higher number of conclusion markers (C) as can be seen from Tab. 5. These markers can be found at the closing of the lectures to make a summary of the topics covered or to recapitulate parts of the lecture.

| <C> | | Lecturer 1 | Lecturer 2 | Lecturer 3 | Totals (n) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Closing | L1 (Greek) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| <C-C> | L2 (English) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Recapitulation markers <C-R> | L1 (Greek) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| | L2 (English) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Prospectives <C-P> | L1 (Greek) | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| | L2 (English) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Retrospectives <C-RT> | L1 (Greek) | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| | L2 (English) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

Table 5. Conclusion markers

More specifically, recapitulation markers are used in an explicit way and include verbs such as *summarize* or phrases such as *as a conclusion* or *in short*:

(17) **<C-R> Εν ολίγοις** η κεντρική ιδέα της ελεύθερης οικονομίας συνίσταται στην πίστη ότι ο ανταγωνισμός της αγοράς που δεν επιδέχεται έξωθεν ρυθμίσεις και παρεμβάσεις τείνει προς την ισορροπία μακροπρόθεσμα <C-R> [**In short** the central idea of a free-market economy lies on the belief that the competition in the market, which does not allow for outside regulations and interference tends to balance itself in the long run]

Conclusion markers are also to be found in the English corpus, in much lower numbers, however, and when they appear they borrow words derived from the Greek language as in the following example where the lecturer uses the noun "epilogue" to end the session:

(18) <C-R> **Now an epilogue** the Greek TV history is without doubt an interesting one it has everything ah intrigues as you see development and notable stories the programmes as of every TV industry so there's a lot for many uses information entertainment a companion when you're doing household jobs and you want to have a friend <C-R> <C-RT> it is now a period of quality drop **as I told you before** <C-RT> but my estimation is it is going to reborn itself (.) thank you

In general, however, the English corpus is rather poor in conclusion markers, as in most cases there does not seem to be any specific signalling for the end of the lectures. The following sequence is a characteristic example of a rather abrupt way to end the session:

(19) <C-RT> OK then if you don't have any questions on the text **we've already discussed** more or less about the plan <C-RT> <C-P> **I'll be waiting** your plan <C-P> (.) and OK (.) that's it

### 4.4. Results from the interviews

The interviews with the students focus on their perception regarding lecture experience (attitude, what they appreciate in a lecture, self-rating of comprehension), their problems (difficulties with technical vocabulary, inadequate signalling on the part of the teacher, speed of delivery, concentration) and the strategies used to overcome these difficulties (note-taking, asking questions, peer help).

Of the twelve students who were interviewed 10 reported that lectures were the most common type of teaching style in their home university. Only 3 of the students reported to have had previous experience in integrated learning before. Most students self-rated their listening proficiency as "quite good", however, it is estimated that it is a level below than that required by university level, something which probably could be attributed to their limited exposure to the genre of formal lectures in the FL.

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**320**

When interviewed about what they appreciate more in their FL lectures all of them opted for more supplementary material (power point presentations, handouts) and a clearer presentation of the main points of the lecture by the teacher. In general, the students seem to appreciate a structured lecture with a clear breakdown of its stages, and they agreed that repetition of the main points and occasional synopsis during the lessons belong to the strategies that a good lecturer employs (see examples 20 and 21 from the interviews):

(20)  He repeats the main mains which is good it helps to remember

(21)  When I listen I concentrate better when the teacher says one, two, three for the topics it's easier to understand

Regarding difficulties most students expressed their worry over technical vocabulary as can be seen from the excerpt that follows:

(22)  I thought in general the lectures were pretty difficult (.) the English language that is used (.) because I don't really have a lot of knowledge about the subjects and then I find it pretty difficult to understand (.) because they use a lot of terms I don't know

The strategies adopted by most students to overcome their difficulties include note-taking and marking the handouts given by the lectures, efforts to concentrate harder and asking questions to the lecturers.  However, during the observation of the lectures it was noted that despite the lecturers' efforts to check the understanding of the content by asking direct questions ("Do you understand all these"? "Am I talking too fast"? "Are there any questions"?), there was limited response on the part of the students. When there was such a response in most cases it was simply to ask the lecturer to slow down his speech delivery. This reluctance could be attributed to their level of general listening proficiency but also to their difficulties with new concepts and terminology, a finding also reported by Hellekjaer (2010) in a study on lecture comprehension in English-medium courses in Norway.  Overall, it seems that although the students involved are satisfied with the programme, listening to a lecture in a foreign language appears to be a difficult task for which they are not well prepared for. Therefore, content teachers need to help students achieve this goal and, during this process, they need to examine and evaluate their own lecturing styles.

The interviews with the lecturers focused on differences between teaching in Greek and English. It is interesting to note that all three lecturers stressed the importance of metadiscourse in the organization of the English lessons, as can be seen from what a lecturer said in the interview:

(23)  In English you need to have a better structure to guide you through the different parts or else you might get confused and forget where you're going

It seems, then, that the use of metadiscursive devices is a strategy valued by both students and teachers which contributes to L2 lecture comprehension. In addition, teachers voice their concern about their speaking skills which they consider as "rather weak" in contrast to reading which they describe as "quite good".  They admit that this weakness is the "cause of slow rhythm, too much repetition, shorter and simpler sentences, and directly translating from the Greek text". Indeed, they note that their difficulties with speaking in English but also the students' difficulties with comprehension lead them to frustration and to a simplification of the course content. This is quite a serious issue as it involves the quality of content provided by the CLIL lessons (Creese 2005). For a successful implementation of the CLIL approach, content teachers must ensure the learning of content at a level which adequately represents the standards expected to achieve in the native language.  If due to the language difficulties of the students and teachers an excessive simplification takes place then we need to question the proper implementation of CLIL in these contexts (Coyle *et. al.* 2010). However, in this context, classroom observation has revealed that our teachers are linguistically capable of teaching content through English in the sense that they possess the general language skills and the specific terminology of their discipline. The lectures would profit, nevertheless, from a clearer structure in lecture organization and from an explicit use of metadiscursive devices during the different phases of the sessions, a strategy highly appreciated by both students and teachers in this study.  On the whole, it seems that there

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**321**

is a need for language-oriented teacher education for content lecturers. It is standard practice in the relevant literature to recommend teacher training for content teachers or collaborative work in the form of team teaching by bringing together language and content academics (Coyle *et. al.* 2010, Marsh & Wolff 2007). In this framework some European universities have instituted compulsory language courses for content teachers as well as courses on pedagogical skills on English-medium instruction (Klaassen 2008). However, it needs to be pointed out that the lecturers in the present study seem to be rather skeptical in receiving some form of training to improve their language competences. Their reluctance lies mainly in the established notion that their main purpose is to teach content but it also could be attributed to their insecurity of handling the purely linguistic aspects of learning as one of the lecturers has pointed out:

> (24)  I have some problems with syntax and grammar myself and I don't think I am capable of pointing out what is correct in English. After all it is content what is important

It is obvious that the lecturers in the present study are unaware of the pedagogic complexity of the CLIL approach, in which content and language objectives share the same status, a finding also reported by Klaassen (2008) in a study at the University of Delft. It is clear that efforts should be made to sensitize teachers as to the advantages of integrated instruction. In this line, institutions should assume the key role in convincing lecturers as to the usefulness of CLIL and the pedagogies associated with it by actively implementing teacher training courses which would reinforce the lecturers' competence in English, providing them also with the opportunity to collaborate with language academics. Following the initiative of the Peninsula Technikon in Cape Town (Jacobs, 2007), such courses and seminars could effectively bring together language and content lecturers by offering an exchange of experiences regarding the use of pedagogical strategies and by encouraging the collaboration between these two groups of academics in a joint effort for the proper implementation of the content and language integrated approach.

## 5.  Conclusion

This small-scale study has shown that, on the whole, university teachers use similar types of metadiscursive markers to organize their lectures both in the L1 and in the L2. The analysis of the data suggests that lecturers seem to replicate their lecturing styles and transfer types and linguistic realizations from the L1 to the L2, a finding also reported by Dafouz Milne & Núñez-Perucha (2010). Regarding the differences between the two sets of data it was observed that the Greek data exhibit more specific signalling during the phase transitions, especially when moving from one part of the lecture to another and when summarizing parts or the whole of the lecture. In addition, the Greek corpus features a wider variety of metadiscursive markers and also includes a set of terms which have more specific reference, something which allows for higher levels of comprehension.

Regarding CLIL considerations, this paper has attempted to offer a description of the characteristics of a particular teaching style (the lecture), which is the most common instructional method adopted in higher education. The above findings could be of benefit to university teachers and CLIL teacher training in tertiary education. In particular, FL lecturers could identify the connection between specific metadiscourse signalling and a clearer organization of the parts of the lecture, a positive strategy noted by both students and teachers in the interviews. More specifically, FL lecturers would benefit from having ready access to a comprehensive set of L2 markers used for moving to different phases during the lecture, which would be a useful tool for the teaching of content through a FL in a university lecture.

Overall, there seems to be a pressing need for specific language policies and teacher training programmes in CLIL university settings as the CLIL approach is increasingly becoming an important instrument in supporting the European Commission's objective of improving the FL competence of its citizens.

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**322**

## 6. References

Benelux Bologna Secretariat 2007-2010. *The official Bologna process website*, July 2007 – June 2010, (http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/) (2 October 2013).

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

Chaudron, Craig & Ritchards, Jack (1986). The effect of discourse markers on the comprehension of lectures. *Applied Linguistics 7*(2), 113-125.

Coyle, Do, Hood, Philip, & Marsh, David (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford Camiciottoli, Belinda (2005). Adjusting a business lecture for an international audience: A case study. *English for Specific Purposes 24*, 183-199.

Crawford Camiciottoli, Belinda (2007). *The language of business studies lectures.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Creese, Angela (2005). Is this content-based language teaching? *Linguistics and Education, 16*(2), 188-204.

Dafouz, Emma, & Núñez, Begoña (2010). Metadiscursive devices in university lectures. In Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Tarja Nikula & Ute Smit (eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 213-233.

Dudley-Evans, Tony (1994). Variations in the discourse patterns favoured by different disciplines and their pedagogical implications. In John Flowerdew (ed.) *Academic listening: Research perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP, 146-158.

Dörnyei, Zoltán (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eggins, Suzanne (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional grammar*. London: Pinter.

Eurydice, (2006). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe.* European Commission: Brussels. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/languages/documents/studies/clil-at-school-in-europe_en.pdf (2 October 2013)

Flowerdew, John (1994). *Academic listening: Research perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP.

Halliday, Michael, A. K & Hasan, Ruqaiya (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, Michael, A. K., & Matthiessen, Christian, M., (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Arnold.

Hellekjær, Glenn O. (2010). Language matters: Assessing lecture comprehension in Norwegian English-medium higher education. In Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Tarja Nikula & Ute Smit (eds.), *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 233-258.

Hyland, Ken (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Oxford: Continuum.

Jacobs, Cecilia (2007). Integrating Content and language: Whose job is it anyway? In, Robert Wilkinson & Vera Zegers (eds.), *Researching content and language integration in higher education*. Nijmegen: Valkof Pers, 35-47.

Jefferson, Gail (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene H. Lerner, (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 13-31.

Klassen, Renate (2008). Preparing lecturers of English-medium instruction. In Robert Wilkinson & Vera Zegers (eds.), *Realising content and language integration in higher education*. Maastricht: Maastricht University Press, 32-42.

Marsh, David. & Wolff, Dieter (eds.) (2007). *Diverse contexts-converging goals: CLIL in Europe.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Martin, James 1997. *Analysing genre: Functional parameters*. In Frances Cristie and James Martin (eds.) Genre and institutions. London: Continuum, 3-39.

Morell, Teresa (2004). Interactive lecture discourse for university EFL students. *English for specific purposes 23*(3), 325-338.

Wächter, Bernt & Maiworm, Friedhelm (2008). *English-taught programmes in European higher education.* Bonn: Lemmens.

Wilkinson, Robert (ed.) (2004). *Integrating content and language: Meeting the challenge of a multilingual higher education*. Maastricht: Universitaire Pers.

Young, Lynne (1994). University lectures – macro-structures and micro-features. In John Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic Listening: Research perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 159-176.

G. Budin and V. Lušicky (eds.), Languages for Special Purposes in a Multilingual, Transcultural World. Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Languages for Special Puporses, 8-10 July 2013, University of Vienna, Vienna. Vienna: University of Vienna.

**323**