DE GRUYTER

Branka Živković*

A discourse analysis of Montenegrin university lectures: How structured are they?

Summary: In comparison to different genres of written discourse, the structure of university lectures remains insufficiently explored. This paper examines which structural elements the mediostructure of Montenegrin lectures consists of, what functions they serve and what features are typical in their internal organisation. The study further aims to determine which linguistic resources are frequently used in the units identified, as well as to define their functions and examine the relation between the mediostructural units and their linguistic characteristics. Applying a part of Cook's model (1975) and conducting frequency and qualitative analyses, we explore a specially compiled corpus of Montenegrin linguistic lectures. The analysis reveals that the lecture mediostructure includes four structural components performing specific communicative functions. They are characterised by the common use of specific linguistic features influenced by the unit in question. The results could be useful to lecturers to successfully plan and structure their lectures, as well as for future research regarding this institutional genre.

Keywords: university lectures, internal organisation, mediostructure, linguistic features, functions

1 Introduction

One of the goals of tertiary education is to transfer knowledge in a discipline from lecturers to students irrespective of the language in which communication in the classroom takes place. In university settings, lectures are considered to be the most important learning medium, a crucial academic genre that students have to rely on as they often serve the sole source of information (Flowerdew & Miller 1996: 121, 328). Not only do lecturers impart information through lectures, but they create a powerful learning environment to facilitate the learning process applying different involvement strategies like, among others, engaging students in

*Corresponding author: Branka Živković, PhD,** Univerzitet Crne Gore, Filološki fakultet, Danila Bojovića bb, 81400 Nikšić, E-Mail: brankaz@ucg.ac.me

discussion, fostering their motivation, provoking their critical thinking, initiating them into the discipline conventions. Equally, the structural organisation of lectures is another aspect of great importance. On one hand, different approaches to analysing lecture structure (e.g. genre-based approach) could be of value in developing tools for teaching lecture comprehension (Thompson 1994: 13). On the other, the familiarity with the discoursal structure of the genre in question could also be of use to lecturers when planning their lectures in order to structure them in the most effective way (Flowerdew 1994: 14).

Several analyses of the university lecture structure or its individual parts have been conducted to date – see, for instance, Cook (1975), Young (1990, 1994), Thompson (1994) and Cheng (2012). Cook (1975) and Young (1990) investigated the lecture macrostructure (i.e. the overall structure), whereas Thompson (1994) and Cheng (2012) examined the structure of comparatively shorter lecture parts, lecture introductions and lecture conclusions respectively. Neither study has specifically focused on the investigation of the lectures' central part as the longest one. Furthermore, the mentioned studies analysed the structure of lectures given in English. The structure of lectures delivered in other languages, more precisely in the BCMS[1] (Bosnian/Croatian/Montenegrin/Serbian) context, has not been investigated until now.

Bearing all this in mind, this paper aims to analyse the mediostructure of academic lectures in the linguistics discipline audio-recorded at the University of Montenegro and subsequently transcribed for the purpose of the study. The focus is on the analysis of the lectures' central part and its linguistic characteristics. The author of the study applies a structural-linguistic approach, which in particular aspects rests on the seminal work done by Cook (1975), but also performs quantitative and qualitative analyses.

The article opens with an overview of the studies dealing with the analysis of the macrostructure and its structural parts. This section on theoretical background precedes the current study section and the details on the corpus and methodology. The analysis is presented in the results section followed by the conclusion, where the results are summarised and certain conclusions reached.

---

1 Although the four languages have become official languages of the former Yugoslav Republics, they represent one language from the linguistic point of view (Bugarski 2018: 101).

2 Theoretical background

Previous research on the discourse structure of lectures includes four widely influential analyses done by Cook (1975), Young (1990, 1994), Thompson (1994) and Cheng (2012). What characterises Cook's pioneering work of the analysis of five lectures (1975) is the application of Sinclair and Coulthard's model of classroom discourse (1975) in a modified form. Defining lectures exclusively as forms of a monologue, Cook (1975) is of the opinion that the lecture discourse organisation cannot be determined in terms of the Birmingham System introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). For that reason, Cook (1975: 65) proposes five ranks but with a slight difference in terminology. For the first Sinclair and Coulthard's three ranks *lesson*, *transaction* and *exchange*, he introduces the terms *lecture*, *exposition* and *episode*, *i.e.* units composed of a series of expositions further segmented into four classes of episodes: *expectation*, *focal*, *developmental* and *closing*. These are realised by smaller components called *moves*. As the lowest structural elements Cook found *acts*, noting that some of them were first identified by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). Nonetheless, Cook's model was criticised as being unable to describe the boundaries of these units and to say much about their internal structure (Flowerdew 1994: 16).

One of the fairly influential studies of lecture discourse structure was conducted by Young (1990, 1994). In the analysis of macro- and micro-structure of seven lectures in sociology, economy, engineering and geology, she introduced an analytical unit *phase* defined as a 'strand of discourse that recurs discontinuously throughout a particular language event' (Young 1994: 165). Her results demonstrate that the lectures are composed of six phases divided into two groups: metadiscoursal and those referring to lecture content. The former includes *discourse structuring*, *conclusion* and *evaluation phase*, whereas the latter is composed of *interaction phase*, *theory or content* and *example phase*. The advantage of this approach is seen in the possibility to be used in the analysis of different types of lectures (Flowerdew 1994: 17). However, Young (1990: 46) restricted her analysis to only the sentence level, and she did not perform quantitative analysis of the studied aspects.

Academic lectures have also been examined within the genre analysis framework. The articles based on this approach deal with the analysis of specific aspects of lecture discourse. They refer to the investigation into the structural organisation of lecture introductions and closings. The leading scientific papers throwing light on these aspects are those of Thompson (1994) and Cheng (2012).

Following Swales' model of the research article introductions (1981, 1990), in her analysis of 18 lecture introductions in applied linguistics, medicine and engineering, Thompson (1994) revealed the lecture introductions' structure to be com-

posed of two *functions* and their *subfunctions*. The first function, called *set up lecture framework*, provides 'information about the topic, scope, structure, and aims of the lecture' (Thompson 1994: 176). It includes internal subfunctions – *announce topic*, *outline structure*, *indicate scope* and *present aims*. The other function, named *putting topic in context*, 'establishes a context for the content of the lecture, by indicating the relevance and importance of the topic and relating it to what the audience already knows' (Thompson 1994: 176). It is composed of three subfunctions – *show importance/relevance of topic*, *relate 'new' to 'given'* and *refer to earlier lectures*.

Cheng (2012) investigates the structure of 56 lecture closings or 7,409 words, and develops a framework composed of *stages* and *strategies*. She further analyses how class size may influence the ways lecturers close their lectures. Cheng (2012) concludes that three strategies – *explicitly indicating the end of lecture*, *explaining course plans for the next class* and *dismissing the class*, are most frequently used in the examined corpus of university lectures closings.

The review given above suggests that the discourse of university lectures represents both a fruitful and interesting area for further research. Nevertheless, the listed studies are all EAP oriented, and lack investigations of the relation between the discourse structure and its linguistic realisations in lectures given in other languages. Regarding the BCMS context, no research to date has explored the structure of academic lectures and its linguistic features. To accentuate the significance of conducting such an investigation, it is important to mention that the researchers in the schemata theory (Van Dijk & Kintsch 1978; Carrell & Eisterhold 1983; Widdowson 1983; Carrell 1984; Carrell 1987) consider the comprehension of narrative genres to be determined by the familiarity with their entire suprasentential or rhetorical organisation. Yang (2010: 175) is of the opinion that schema plays an important role in L1 and L2 language systems, and no matter what language readers speak, if they are familiar with the content, formal and linguistic schema, they will comprehend a text, and if they lack such knowledge, they will fail to understand it. Gregory and Malcolm (1981: 36) also view the relation between the formal and linguistic schema of a genre as necessarily interdependent.

As for spoken academic discourse, when studying lecture introductions, Thompson (1994: 184) suggested that increasing students' familiarity with and facility in using the lecture introductions framework could improve their ability to comprehend the rest of the lecture. In a similar vein, Mulligan and Kirkpatrick (2000: 314) argued that students should be able to identify the overall macrostructure of a lecture so as to grasp it. Taking into account that research papers on the textual organisation of the lecture central part are lacking, there is a need for further studies, particularly those dealing with corpora that have not been explored before.

3 The current study

The current study will extend the previous research on the textual organisation of academic lectures by investigating how lecturers structurally develop the lecture's central part and which linguistic resources they frequently employ. Only two aforementioned studies, those of Cook (1975) and Young (1994), dealt with the lecture macrostructure, and the other two – Thompson's (1994) and Cheng's (2012) examined the comparatively shorter lecture parts of introductions and conclusions. None of the studies specifically investigated the lecture mediostructure. This is a very important topic of examination as it represents the longest structural part of the genre in question, where the lecturer presents complex concepts and covers certain points shortly announced in lecture introductions (Thompson 1994) and summarised in lecture conclusions (Cheng 2012). Moreover, all the studies reviewed explored academic lectures in English, whereas Montenegrin university lectures have not been examined, and the research in the broader BCMS context has not been conducted to date.

Given all the said, four exploratory research questions are formulated in this paper:

– RQ 1. Taking Biber's view of lectures (1988: 69) as prepared and planned speeches into account, the key question is: what structural units is the central part of the lectures under study composed of?
– RQ 2. What functions do these units perform and what characterises their internal organisation?
– RQ 3. Which linguistic resources are frequently employed in the identified units and which function do they serve?
– RQ 4. Is there a relation between the units found and their linguistic characteristics?

The current research is based on the corpus of Montenegrin lectures in the linguistics discipline as the author is the most familiar with it and was in a position to compile the Montenegrin corpus. Taking into account that linguistics deals, among others, with theories of language structure, variation and use, and that the university professors whose lectures were recorded are language experts more aware of the language they use than their colleagues in other scientific fields, the discipline could influence the results regarding mediostructural components of the lectures under study. However, further research on the structural organisation of the lectures' central part in other disciplines should be conducted to compare its results with those presented in the paper for the sake of making generalisations in this respect.

Although Montenegrin is a small local language, the study could be of relevance to professors holding lectures in BCMS, spoken by "nearly 20 million peo-

ple in four countries of the western Balkans—the Republics of Bosnia and Herze-govina, Croatia, Montenegro, and Serbia" and a large number of speakers living in diaspora[2]. Besides, most of the previous studies concerning the macrostructure of academic lectures were not based on the use of text analysis software. For in-stance, in her macro- and microanalyses of lectures Young does not use numer-ical counts or frequencies of the studied aspects (Young 1990: 85), which is of considerable importance when performing a subsequent qualitative analysis.

The results of this study could be useful both to students and lecturers. As students' ability to identify the lecture structure can significantly affect its under-standing (Mulligan & Kirkpatrick 2000: 317–320), students' familiarisation with the lecture mediostructure as its longest structural part could lead to its better comprehension. On the other hand, lecturers would be able to successfully plan and structure their lectures as it affects the students' understanding of the lecture. The findings may also be used for future research based on the comprehension of lectures by non-native[3], as well as native university students of Montenegrin.

In the next section, the details on the corpus and methodology are reported followed by the results and discussion and conclusion sections respectively.

4 Corpus and methodology

This research focuses on the analysis of a corpus of twelve Montenegrin university lectures in the linguistics discipline, containing 86,766 words with the duration of 12 hours, 43 minutes and 26 seconds. Since an electronic corpus of the academic spoken and written Montenegrin language has not been compiled to date, the corpus of Montenegrin lectures was created. In the first stage, the lectures[4] in undergraduate-level courses were audio-recorded. Different speakers held the lectures as the aim was to avoid the possibility of individual deviations. The lec-tures were delivered in various subfields of linguistics, such as phonetics, accent-ology, dialectology, orthography, syntax, semantics, discourse analysis, metho-dology, sociolinguistics. The objective of the paper was not to analyse lectures according to the disciplinary variation but, within the context of linguistics, to examine mediostructure and its linguistic features. In the second stage, audio files were transcribed by means of the common transcription symbols used in

---

2 Taken from: https://slavic.ku.edu/why-study-bosniancroatianserbian-bcs-ku-slavic-depart ment.

3 Foreign students can study Montenegrin at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels at the University of Montenegro.

4 We obtained formal permission to record lectures at the University of Montenegro.

discourse analysis (included in Appendix). The details on the corpus are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Corpus details.

Lecture codes	Course / Subject	No. of words	Lecture duration (h:min:s)
ML^5_1	Introduction to linguistics I	7,946	48:52
MP_2	Sociolinguistics	7,800	56:43
MP_3	Phonetics	4,218	53:15
MP_4	Contemporary Montenegrin: The syntax of simple and complex sentences	6,674	1:05:32
MP_5	Contemporary Montenegrin: The syntax of cases	7,321	1:01:59
MP_6	Introduction to linguistics II	9,757	44
MP_7	Discourse analysis	2,220	40:46
MP_8	Methodology of teaching language and literature	16,204	1:46:20
MP_9	Contemporary Montenegrin: Standardisation and orthography	3,553	45:36
MP_{10}	Contemporary Montenegrin: Orthography with speech culture	3,535	46:03
MP_{11}	Contemporary Montenegrin: Accentology and introduction to dialectology	4,933	48:53
MP_{12}	Semantics	12,605	2:16: 27
No. of words and duration in total		86,766	12:43:26

The third stage encompassed the process of analysis which was done in four substages. The first substage included the manual analysis of the transcribed lectures. Lectures cannot be seen as one whole, as Cook (1975) and Young (1990, 1994) assert. The author detected the presence of certain signals, boundary markers, which divided lectures into three parts – introductions, a central part and conclusions. The boundary between lecture introductions and mediostructure, as well as mediostructure and lecture closings, was drawn starting from boundary markers or discourse units in English, such as *ok*, *now*, *right*, *right so*, as well as the combination of discourse markers and filled pauses such as *erm now*, *er okay* (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). The author used their translation equivalents and similar units with the initiating and closing functions in Montenegrin. More pre-

---

5 The abbreviation stands for Montenegrin lecture.

cisely, the lecture's central part was separated from its introduction and conclusion following 1) boundary markers, 2) markers/constructions initiating the beginning of the lecture mediostructure and those initiating the lecture conclusion, thereby marking the end of the lecture's central part, and 3) contextual analysis including the semantic criterion – the lecture mediostructure started after the topic announcement and/or its contextualisation in the lecture introduction and finished before the semantic indication of the lecture conclusion.

The list of boundary markers and markers/constructions used for separating the lecture's central part from the lecture introduction and conclusion is given in Table 2.

Table 2: Boundary markers and markers used for separating the lectures' central part from the lectures' introduction and conclusion

Boundary markers and markers initiating the lecture mediostructure	Boundary markers and markers initiating the lecture conclusion
Dobro 'well'	*Dobro* 'well'
Dakle 'so'	*Eto* 'so/well'
Dobro dakle 'well so/well therefore'	*Ok* 'ok'
Znači 'so'	*Znači* 'so'
Sad 'now'	*Ok znači* 'ok so'
A sad 'and now'	*E dobro* 'and well'
Pa onda sad 'well now then'	*E sad* 'and now'
Zp 'filled pause'	*Eto toliko o...* 'so that's all about...'
Kada govorimo o... 'when talking about...'	*Mi smo ovim zaokružili...* 'with this we finished...'
I idemo dalje sa 'and we are moving on with'	

The boundary markers and the markers/constructions with the initiating and closing functions proved useful in the segmentation of 91.6 % of the lectures. These units often appeared in combinations, for instance, *a sad* 'and now', *ok znači* 'ok so', *eto toliko o...* 'so that's all about...' (see Table 2). It should be noted that only one lecture did not have boundary markers at all, and two had boundary markers and the markers/constructions initiating the lecture's central part, but did not have those marking the lecture's conclusion. In such cases the boundary between the lecture's mediostructure and the lecture's introduction and conclusion was set after the contextual analysis involving the semantic criterion. Namely, the lecture's central part was considered to have started at the point of the lecturer's moving into the content of the topic after its announcement and/or

contextualisation presented in the lecture's introduction, and to have finished before the lecturer's concluding the entire lecture (e.g. explicitly marking the end of the lecture, giving plans for the next lecture, and dismissing the class).

The second substage referred to the structural analysis of the lectures' central part. It was not possible to use a genre-based approach which was applied as an effective research method in the identification of structural components of lecture introductions and closings (Thompson 1994; Cheng 2012). The reason for that lies in the length of the lecture central part. It is the longest part of the lecture compared to lecture introductions and conclusions. The examination thus imposed the application of structural-linguistic perspective and a part of Cook's model (1975). The structural elements taken from Cook (1975) are the hierarchical units *expositions* and *episodes*. The lecture mediostructure is composed of thematic units or *expositions* which can be further segmented into lower components marked as *episodes*.

In the third substage, a quantitative analysis of specific linguistic features of the identified structural units was conducted by means of *AntConc 3.2.4.w* software (Anthony 2011). It was used to measure the frequency of certain linguistic resources, such as boundary markers, verbs and verb phrases. Additionally, the occurrences of different question types and argumentative models were manually extracted. In the fourth substage, the quantitative analysis was followed by a qualitative one including the interpretation of the results and, to a certain extent, pragmatic analysis.

5 Results and discussion

5.1 Mediostructure of lectures

The analysis of the corpus yielded the following internal organisation of the lecture mediostructure (Table 3):

Table 3: Mediostructure units and their frequency.

Mediostructure	Frequency (%)
Expositions	100
Expectation episodes	25
Focal episodes	77.4
Developmental episodes	100
Closing episodes	61.3

Table 3 shows that the lectures' central part is realised through *expositions* composed of the lower units *expectation*, *focal*, *developmental* and *closing episodes*. It further demonstrates that all Montenegrin lectures include expositions, and all episodes are obligatory apart from the expectation ones.

More specifically, the lecture mediostructure is composed of a series of expositions. The Montenegrin lectures can have minimum one and maximum four expositions. Expositions are structural units representing complete thematic cycles, further segmented into a series of smaller units – *episodes*. According to Cook's scheme (1975: 66), the structure of an exposition includes: *preliminary*, *orientation*, *development* and *terminal*. Expectation episodes represent the realisations of a preliminary part of an exposition. Orientation is realised by focal episodes, whereas developmental episodes can be found in development. Closing episodes are a characteristic of terminal.

When their structure is in question, Cook (1975: 66) believes that all episodes are composed of *focus*, *extension* and *conclusion*. However, the results obtained are in line with Van Dijk's view (1981: 177) of episodes as coherent sequences of sentences of a discourse, linguistically marked for beginning and/or end, and further defined in terms of some kind of 'thematic unity'. In other words, not each episode has its conclusion, but it, of course, has its beginning part.

The following subsection discusses the linguistic features frequently used in each episode respectively.

5.1.1 Expectation episodes

Expectation episodes define a context or background of expositions in the mediostructure of lectures. Lecturers contextualise topics mostly by the use of argumentative models. The most dominant one is the *general – specific* model applied in its modified form. In comparison to McCarthy's model (1991: 158) initiated by a general statement, developed through an indefinite number of specific statements and closed by the repetition of the general statement, in expectation episodes lecturers tend to reformulate their specific statements, which consequently has *reformulation of specific statement* as an additional element. The modified model, therefore, is not finished with the repetition of the general statement. A new element is necessary as students need information to be given in the most explicit way. By using it, lecturers emphasise the key information regarding the topic:

(1)   *(**opšta konstatacija 1**) Kad je u pitanju <lokativ>, sâmo ime kaže da se on određuje, prije svega, kao padež <mjesta>, ali i kao padež nepravog objekta. (**posebna konstatacija 1**) Kao padež mjesta on, u stvari, ima*

*odredbenu funkciju, a kao padež objekta ima dopunsku, odnosno komplementarnu funkciju. (**posebna konstatacija 2**) I u jednom, i u drugom slučaju lokativ se upotrebljava samo sa predlozima. (**reformulacija posebne konstatacije 2**) Znači, lokativ je jedini zavisni padež koji nema upotrebu* <u>bez</u> *predloga, odnosno upotrebljava se samo sa predlozima. (**opšta konstatacija 2**) Broj predloga koji ide sa lokativom relativno je mali. (**posebna konstatacija 1**) Imamo šest predloga...* (ML$_3$)

(**general statement 1**) When talking about <locative>, its name suggests that it is, above all, a case of <place>, but at the same time the case of indirect object. (**specific statement 1**) As a case of place it, in fact, has a determiner function, as a case of object it has an adverbial or complementary function. (**specific statement 2**) In both cases locative is used only with prepositions. (**reformulation of specific statement 2**) So, locative is the only depending case that cannot be used <u>without</u> prepositions, that is, it is used only with prepositions. (**general statement 2**) The number of prepositions used with locative is relatively low. (**specific statement 2**) There are six prepositions...

5.1.2 Focal episodes

Expectation episodes have a frequency of 25 %, meaning they are an optional element in the lecture mediostructure (see Table 3). In most of the cases, focal episodes initiate the mediostructure of Montenegrin lectures, which emphasises their prominent status.

In focal episodes lecturers announce the topic of an exposition. At this point, a distinction between *announce topic* as a subfunction in lecture introductions (Thompson 1994) and the similar function of focal episodes should be made. Focal episodes are obligatory structural elements in expositions. Each exposition deals with a new subtopic announced in a focal episode. On the other hand, in lecture introductions, in *function 1 – set up lecture framework*, lecturers announce the topic of the entire lecture, not of its individual expositions.

Considering their function, it is worth mentioning that, contrary to expectation, focal episodes are comparatively shorter, so there is not enough space to allow for argumentative models to be developed:

(2)   ***E sad*** *da vidimo akcenat u složenim riječima.* (ML$_6$)
       And now let's see the stress in compound words.

Example 2 illustrates the function of a focal episode announcing the topic of the current exposition (the accent in compound words). The boundary marker in bold initiates a new phase in the mediostructure.

As focal episodes introduce topics of succeeding expositions, results show that, semantically, three groups of verbs serve as their most typical lexical exponents. Let us examine table 4:

Table 4: Frequency of verbs and verb phrases in focal episodes.

Verbs and verb phrases	Frequency	
	N. of occurrences	%
reći 'say'	6	22.2
vidjeti 'see'	6	22.2
preći/prelaziti na 'move on'	3	11.1
kazati 'say'	2	7.4
raditi/obraditi 'cover'	4	14.8
govoriti 'talk'	1	3.7
stići do 'reach'	2	7.4
osvrnuti se 'mention'	1	3.7
ići dalje 'proceed'	1	3.7
doći do 'come to'	1	3.7
In total	27	100

At first sight, table 4 includes miscellaneous verbs, but looking at it more closely, they belong to three semantic groups. The first one refers to the communication verbs *reći* 'say', *kazati* 'say', *govoriti* 'talk' and *osvrnuti se* 'mention' (see e.g. 3). Their overall frequency accounts for 37 %. They reflect one of the basic characteristics of lectures – displaying features of everyday conversation.

(3)   *Prvo **ćemo** nešto **reći** o lokativnim sintagmama sa predlogom pri.* (ML$_3$)
      First **we will say** something about locative phrases with the preposition *pri*.

The second group, composed of cognitive verbs *vidjeti* 'see', *raditi/obraditi* 'cover', signals focal episodes in the same percentage as the previous one. The verb

vidjeti does not carry the meaning of perception, but the one of the verbs *find out*, *discover*[6], as in:

(4) *E sad **da vidimo** kako to izgleda kod dvosložnih i trosložnih riječi.* (ML$_6$)
     And now, **let's see** what happens with two-syllable and three-syllable words.

Similarly, the verbs *raditi* and *obraditi* denote the cognitive process in which students have an opportunity to find out something new:

(5) *I danas ćemo upravo **raditi** (zp) <u>dva</u> dijela semantike.* (ML$_4$)
     And today we will just **cover** (zp) <u>two</u> parts of semantics.

Aspectual verbs occupy the second position in Table 4. They include the verbs *ići dalje* 'proceed', *stići do* 'reach', *doći do* 'come to' *preći/prelaziti na* 'move on', indicating the beginning, continuation or termination of the action expressed by a verb (Stanojčić & Popović 1992: 248):

(6) *I **idemo dalje** sa ocjenjivanjem.* (ML$_8$)
     And **we're proceeding** with the assessment.
(7) *E sad **prelazimo** na izuzetke.* (ML$_{10}$)
     And now we **are moving on to** exceptions.

5.1.3 Developmental episodes

Developmental episodes are also found in the Montenegrin corpus. Contrary to expectation episodes, they are obligatory elements in the lecture mediostructure. They always follow focal episodes. If these are absent, developmental episodes are found immediately after lecture introductions.

At this hierarchical level, specific structuredness is observed. The analysed developmental episodes are composed of an introduction, extension and/or conclusion. These results are different from Cook's (1975), but confirm Van Dijk's standpoint (1981: 177) that an episode represents a series of coherent sentences in a discourse with a linguistically marked beginning and/or end and thematic unity. If in all of the instances the structure was composed of three-part units, it

---

6 Biber et al. (1999: 363) categorise the verb *discover* as a cognitive one, which is the synonym of the verb *see* in e.g. 4.

would be too uniform and rigid, which, in fact, appears to be typical of the genres of written academic discourse.

The following two subsections outline the results regarding interactivity of developmental episodes. The analysis demonstrates frequent occurrences of two functional question categories: *questions posed and answered by lecturers* and *questions initiating a student response*.

5.1.3.1 Questions posed and answered by lecturers

Questions posed and answered by lecturers are those where the lecturer performs the roles both of a speaker and a listener. S/he puts and at the same times offers an answer to the question asked. This functional category is realised by the forms listed in Table 5:

Table 5: Forms and frequency of questions posed and answered by lecturers

Questions put and answered by lecturers	Frequency	
	N. of occurrences	(%)
Tag questions	240	55.5
Wh-questions	111	25.5
Questions with a question word/ phrase at the end	28	6.5
Yes/no questions	26	5.9
Multiple questions	15	3.5
Questions about question [7]	6	1.4
Incomplete questions	5	1.2
Embedded questions	2	0.5
Alternative questions	1	0.2
In total	434	100

According to Table 5, there are variations in the frequency of employed question types. The most common are *tag questions* accounting for more than a half of all the questions posed and answered by lecturers.

---

[7] *Questions about question*, *incomplete*, *embedded* and *alternative questions* will not be further discussed because of their low frequency in this functional category.

The analysis shows that Montenegrin lecturers use three different phrases to introduce *tag questions*: *jel' tako*, *jel' da*, *je li* and its short form *jel'*[8]. They are put at the end of statements (see e.g. 8). Tag questions perform different functions. First, using them, lecturers do not elicit a student verbal reaction, but merely assume students to know a piece of information passed on to them. In other words, the information expressed by the statement with the question phrase at the end is supposed to be known by both parties, that way indicating *shared knowledge*:

(8)   ***Konkretna realizacija foneme je <u>glas</u>, jel' tako?*** *Konkretna realizacija lekseme jeste govorena ili pisana riječ, ali leksema kao jedinica je <u>ap-traktna</u>, ona nije konkretna i <u>zato</u> obuhva ta sve moguće te oblike, znači gramatički oblici.* (ML$_2$)

A concrete realisation of a phoneme is a <u>sound</u>, isn't it? A concrete realisation of a lexeme is a spoken or written word, but a lexeme is an <u>abstract</u> unit, it is not concrete and <u>therefore</u> includes all possible forms, that is grammatical forms.

Given that the extract in 8 is the part of the developmental episode on a lexeme, before continuing with its definition, the lecturer starts first by reminding the students of what a phoneme is. So, the *tag question* performs the function of recontextualisation of the already familiar content as to help students better comprehend the points presented.

When the lecturer is of the opinion that students need more information, s/he initiates 're-specifying information' (Schleef 2009: 1111):

(9)   *Enciklopedija je knjiga o <u>stvarima</u>. **Dakle, tu se, obrađuju pojmovi (zp[9]) i prosto vanjezička stvarnost koja postoji svuda, jel' tako?*** (ML$_2$)

Encyclopaedia is the book about <u>things</u>. **So, it covers terms (zp) and actually extralinguistic reality that surrounds us, doesn't it?**

Another important function performed by *tag questions* includes the intensification of the evaluation of the previous statement/s. Let us take a look at example 10.

---

8 See Piper et al. 2005: 679.

9 (zp) stands for the term *zvučna pauza* in Montenegrin, or filled pause in English. The list of transcription symbols is given in the Appendix.

(10) *I mi smo odgovorni ne samo za ono što djeca znaju iz oblasti <jezika>,
nego <u>vrlo</u> često to kako mi radimo s djecom i kako ih <u>mi</u> učimo, u stvari ih
određuje i iz drugih predmeta. Da li oni čitaju kako treba, da li razumiju
to što su pročitali, <u>da li</u> to znaju da izgovore i ispričaju. **To je <u>jako</u> važno,
jel'?** (ML₈)*

We too are responsible not only for what children know from the field
of <language>, but <u>very</u> <u>often</u> how we work with children and how <u>we</u>
teach them, in fact, determines them from other subjects. Do they read
properly, do they understand what they have read, <u>do they</u> know to
utter and retell it? **That is very important, isn't it?**

The statement in bold represents the evaluative content signalled by the amplifier
very and the evaluative adjective *important*; the phrase *isn't it* intensifies the sig-
nificance of the propositional content in the previous statements.

Lecturers use *wh-questions* to introduce a new concept to be defined:

(11) **Šta je afiks?** *To je znači dio koji se dodaje prije ili poslije, prefiks ili su-
fiks.* (ML₆)
What is an affix? It is, in fact, the part added before or after, a prefix or
suffix.

In example 11, a *wh-question* is used to introduce the term *affix*. After putting a
question, the lecturer takes over the role of an interlocutor and provides necessary
information.

The second function of *wh-questions* is introducing the topic of developmen-
tal episodes. They indicate a thematic transition from one exposition to the other.
The following example can serve as an illustration:

(12) **Zašto je možda ova (.) standardizacija crnogorska, po mom mišljen-
ju, <u>krenula</u> loše i napravljen je loš pravopis i loša gramatika?** *Upravo
zato što <u>nijesu</u> <u>dali</u> stručnjacima to da rade. Te poslove su odradili (.)
<u>političari</u> i (zp) laici. Mogu slobodno reći.* (ML₅)
**Why, perhaps, has this (.) Montenegrin standardisation, in my
opinion, <u>started</u> badly and bad orthography and grammar have
been made?** Just because they <u>did not allow</u> experts to do that. Those
jobs have been done by (.) <u>politicians</u> and (zp) laymen. I can freely say
that.

In extract 12, a *wh-question* signals a transition to the topic of a new episode – that
the standardisation of the Montenegrin language has started badly.

Wh-questions can also have an explanatory function. They follow the exemplification act, and lecturers employ them to explain the content given in the preceding examples.

(13) *Ili recimo, On brzo trči.* **Kako trči?** *Brzo. I tu njenu funkciju vrše prilozi.* (ML₁)
      Or, let's say, He runs quickly. **How does he run?** Quickly. And adverbs perform that function.

Example 13 is opened with the exemplification act signalled by *recimo* 'let's say', after which the professor uses a wh-question to enable students to better understand the given content. At the same time, the lecturer answers the question posed.

The following group of questions posed and answered by lecturers includes *questions with a question word/phrase at the end*. They are employed to draw students' attention to the specific information the question refers to.

(14) <u>Pravi</u> *objekat je ime pojma u obliku* <u>akuzativa</u> <u>bez</u> *predloga uz <prave> prelazne glagole. Recimo, Marko zida kuću.* **Objekat je u toj rečenici šta?** *Kuću.* (ML₁)
      <u>Direct</u> object is the name of an entity in the form of <u>accusative</u> <u>without</u> a preposition with <real> transitive verbs. Let's say, Marko is building a house. **The object in that sentence is what?** A house.

Again, what precedes this question type is the exemplification act, signalled by *let's+say* construction. The question concerns a particular piece of information which is supplied by the lecturer.

Yes/no questions, being the most frequent fourth group of questions posed and answered by lecturers, are employed to analyse lecture content to aid students' comprehension.

(15) *Dakle, svlačim sumrak. Sumrak je nije* <u>nešto</u> *što je konkretno (.) kao što svlačimo košulju, predmet koji se svlači.* **Da li je sumrak to?** *Nije.* (ML₄)
      So, I shed twilight. Twilight is not <u>something</u> that is concrete (.) like we take off a shirt, a thing that is taken off. **Is that twilight?** No.

Multiple questions are also employed in developmental episodes to emphasise key lecture points. They are composed of two or more grammatically, semantically and lexically related questions. They deal with the repetition of the first question, and each question is often a reformulation of the first question (Bamford 2000: 167):

(16) ***Kako ćemo ga naučiti da zaključuje, da analizira? Kako? (.) Kako ćete ih naučiti?*** *Tako što ćete ih staviti u situaciju da analiziraju.* (ML$_8$)
How shall we teach them to conclude, to analyse? How? (.) How will you teach them? By putting them in a situation to analyse.

Example 16 is initiated by *multiple questions*. The first question is repeated twice. The questions are linked on grammatical (parallel interrogative structures), lexical (the word *naučiti* 'teach' is repeated as well as the question word *kako* 'how') and semantic levels (*kako ćete naučiti studente da analiziraju i zaključuju* 'how will you teach students to analyse and conclude').

5.1.3.2 Questions initiating a student response

Developmental episodes in the examined lectures contain 458 exchanges[10]. Out of that number, 361 exchanges or 78.8 % are initiated by lecturers by means of different question types, which are classified as *questions initiating a student response*. Their raw occurrences and frequency are given in Table 6:

Table 6: Types and frequency of questions initiating a student response in developmental episodes.

Questions initiating a student response	Frequency	
	N. of occurrences	%
Directives	127	44.7
Wh-questions	41	14.4
Multiple questions	37	13.02
Yes/no questions	26	9.2
Questions with a question word/ phrase at the end	13	4.6
Alternative questions	12	4.2
Incomplete questions[11]	10	3.5
Tag questions	8	2.8

10 *Exchange* represents a structural unit in classroom discourse introduced by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). It is composed of *opening*, *answering* and *follow-up moves*. The number of exchanges includes both those initiated by lecturers and students respectively.
11 *Incomplete*, *tag*, *echo* and *questions about question* will not be further discussed taking into account their low frequency in this functional category.

Table 6: (continued)

Echo questions	7	2.5
Questions about question	3	1.05
In total	284	100

The function of this question category is to elicit answers from students. The highest frequency is recorded in the group of *directives* (44.7 %). Their illocutionary force in most cases depends on the situational context (Quirk et al. 1985: 831). In the lecture context, they play the elicitation role:

(17) *P: (...) **Recite mi neki oblik pisane komunikacije koji ima obilježja usmene komunikacije (...) a koji vam je blizak u svakom slučaju.***
S1: SMS.
P: SMS poruke. Dalje.
S1: Mejl.
P: Elektonska pošta, Internet. (ML$_7$)
P: (...) **Tell me a form of written communication that has a characteristic of spoken ones (...) and anyway that is close to you.**
S1: Text messages.
P: Text messages. Go on.
S1: E-mail.
P: Electronic mail. The Internet.

Example 17 illustrates a lecturer's intention to provoke a student's verbal activity. The directive act is realised by the imperative of the verb *reći* in the second-person plural – *recite* 'tell me'. Other verbs employed in the directive include those of the communicative class, such as *odgovoriti* 'answer', *pitati* 'ask', the cognitive group – *misliti* 'think', *zamisliti* 'imagine', as well as the defective verb *hajde*[12] 'come on' and its short form *ajde*. Let us consider the following example:

(18) *P: Šta je međed u Crnoj Gori simbol? Čega?*
S2: Snage.
P: Snage?

---

[12] *Hajde* is a defective verb having no infinitive form. Its origin goes back to the Turkish language. It has imperative forms for the first-person plural (*hajdemo*) and the second-person plural (*hajdete*) (Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 130).

S3: Nije, nije. ☺

*P: **Ajte da vas čujem. E, ajte, ajte da čujem vaše misljenje, kad nekom kažemo „Kakav je ono međed"*** ☺

Students: ☺ *Grub*

P: Grub, dalje neotesan

S2:   - neotesan

P: = sirov

S2:   - sirov

P: = nekad i glup, jel' tako? (ML$_4$)

P: A bear is a symbol of what in Montenegro?

S2: Strength.

P: Strength?

S3: No, no. ☺

P: **Come on, let me hear you. Well, come on, come on, let me hear your opinion, when we tell somebody "Such a bear s/he is"**. ☺

Students: ☺ Rude.

P: Rude, go on rough-mannered

S2:   - rough-mannered

P: = rough

S2:   - rough

P: = sometimes even stupid, isn't s/he?

The verb *hajde/ajde* is used even three times in the second-person plural – *ajte*, which is a signal of an intensive influence on the part of students to start speaking. Evidently, its meaning is *počni* 'start talking' (Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 130), and it is used with a verb complement – *da čujem vaše misljenje*.

   Wh-questions belong to the second most frequent group in the category of questions initiating a student response. They are asked to make students supply a specific piece of information:

(19)   P*: /'dezət/ (.) **šta je /'dezət/?***
       Studenti: Pustinja.
       *P: Pustinja, **a /di'zə:t/?***
       S2: To je neki kolač nešto
       P: - ne, nego ovo je napustiti ili dezertirati
       S2:   - a da, ovo je glagol
       P: - da, kao glagol. (ML$_6$)
       P: /'dezət/ (.) **what is /'dezət/?**
       Ss: A desert.
       P: A desert, **what about /di'zə: t/?**

S2: That's a cake or something
P: - no, but this is *abandon* or *desert*
S2:   - oh, yes, this is a verb
P: - yes, as a verb.

Extract 19 is a part of an episode on accent and word classes. It is initiated by exemplification, followed by a *wh-question* as to provoke a verbal response in students and connect the already familiar information with the topic of the current episode. A student answers the question and, after confirming the answer as correct in the follow-up move, the lecturer continues with an incomplete question whose obligatory constituents are contextually implied.

The importance of *multiple questions* in developmental episodes is proved by their third position in Table 6. In contrast to *multiple questions* in the group of questions posed and answered by lecturers, their primary function here is to evoke a student's verbal reaction:

(20)   *P: **A šta je sa fondom riječi kojima pojedinci barataju, šta mislite? Koliko vi znate riječi, na primjer, svog jezika?***
       S1: To je ono što sve koristimo.
       P: Tako je. Tu je razlika između aktivne i pasivne leksike, to ćemo pomenuti. (ML$_2$)
       P: **And what about the number of words that individuals use, what do you think? How many words do you know, for example, of your language?**
       S1: That includes all the words that we use.
       P: That's right. There is a difference between active and passive vocabulary, we will mention that.

Extract 20 is initiated by a *wh-question*, which is then specified by another two *wh-questions*. The lecturer addresses students by using the second-person plural pronoun *vi* 'you'. In addition, *multiple questions* are linked on grammatical (identical interrogative structures), lexical (the use of the verbs *baratati* 'use' and *znati* 'know' having similar meanings) and semantic levels (number of words an individual knows).

Table 6 shows that *yes/no questions* are also used in developmental episodes. They are employed to elicit students' responses and to check if students follow and understand the current lecture:

(21)   *P: **Znate li neku takvu skraćenicu (.) koja se piše bez tačke i koja pripada ovoj grupi sažetih skraćenica?***

S4: *Doktor.*

P: *Doktor, skraćenica dr bez tačke.* (ML₉)

P: **Do you know such an abbreviation (.) that is written without a full stop and that belongs to the group of contracted abbreviations?**

S4: Doctor.

P: Doctor, the abbreviation *dr* without a full stop.

Questions with a question word/phrase at the end account for 4.6 % of all the questions initiating a student response. Their function is to elicit precise information from students:

(22)   P: *U primjerima (.) pod tri Za doručkom čita novine, Za večerom gleda televiziju,* **instrumental sa predlogom za ima kakvu funkciju?**

S1: *Vremensku.*

P: *Jeste. Ima vremensku, odnosno obilježava vrijeme onoga što se kazuje upravnim glagolom.* (ML₃)

P: In the examples (.) under 3 *He reads newspapers after breakfast, He watches TV after dinner,* **the instrumental with the preposition *za* has which function?**

S1: Temporal.

P: Yes. It has a temporal function, that is, it signifies the time of the action expressed by the main verb.

Alternative questions are not used as frequently as the questions discussed above. They offer students the choice between two possibilities, which is also a way to enhance greater students' participation in the discussion on lecture content. Although an answer to alternative questions is one of two offered options (Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 623), there are the cases when the answer comprises both possibilities:

(23)   P: *E sad da vidimo šta nam je šta nam je (zp) nosilac značenja.* **Da li je to, šta mislite vi, riječ ili rečenica?**

Studenti: I jedno i drugo.

P: *I jedno i drugo.* (ML₄)

P: And now let's see what carries the meaning (zp). **Is that, what do you think, a word or a sentence?**

Students: Both.

P: Both.

5.1.4 Closing episodes

Apart from expectation, focal and developmental episodes, the mediostructure of Montenegrin university lectures also includes *closing episodes*. Focal episodes are metadiscoursal as they introduce the topic thoroughly discussed in developmental episodes. Unlike them, closing episodes serve the function of indicating retrospective discourse, *i.e.* they briefly summarise covered lecture points. Therefore, their order is strictly defined – they always come after developmental episodes.

Their frequency points to their obligatory status. Out of 31 expositions in total, 19 have closing episodes accounting for 61.3 % (see Table 3).

As for the structuredness of closing episodes, it is not manifested in a rigid model comprising three parts – introduction, middle and conclusion, as Cook asserts (Cook 1975: 68). The analysed episodes consist of coherent sequences of sentences of a discourse, linguistically marked for beginning and/or end, and further defined in terms of some kind of 'thematic unity' (Van Dijk 1981: 177). Hence, it is possible for closing episodes to be realised by just a concluding move:

(24) ***Eto*[13]*, toliko o glagolskim odredbama i dopunama. Imate li nešto da \<pitate\>?*** *(.) Dobro. Onda ćemo sada da pređemo na kongruenciju.* (ML₁)

So, that's all about adverbials and verb complements. Have you got anything to \<ask\>? (.) Ok. Now we will move on to a subject-verb agreement.

Example 24 is opened with the boundary marker *eto* 'so' and the statement that the thematic cycle on adverbials and verb complements has been covered. It is finished with a question of whether students have something to ask, which remains unanswered. Then, a boundary marker *dobro* 'ok' indicates a transition to another exposition on subject-verb agreement.

Besides concluding moves, closing episodes can also be realised by recommending and summarising moves. Let us consider example 25.

(25) ***Dakle****, ove četiri oblasti leksikologije treba da znate i kratko čime se svaka od njih bavi. Kao što vidite, u pitanju su svuda* <u>lekseme</u>*, dakle, leksičke jedinice samo iz različitih aspekata. Prva iz aspekta porijekla, druga iz aspekta vlastitih imena, treća iz aspekta pojedinačnih stručnih oblasti i*

---

13 Mrazović and Vukadinović (1990: 422–423, 428–429) put *eto* in the category of conversational particles. It can be found at the end of conversation or a presentation.

> *termina i četvrta iz aspekta jel' fraza, odnosno frazeologizama u jeziku.* (ML₂)
>
> **So,** you should know these four fields of lexicology and briefly what each of them deals with. As you can see, in question are <u>lexemes</u> everywhere, that is, lexical units just from different aspects. The first one from the origin aspect, the second from the aspect of proper names, the third from the aspect of individual specific fields and terminology and the forth from the aspect of phrases right, that is phraseological units in the language.

The beginning of the closing episode is marked with the boundary marker *dakle* 'so', which at the same time initiates a recommending move signalled by the modal verb *trebati* 'should' in combination with the verb *znati* 'know'. What follows is a summarising move, where the lecturer provides a brief summary of the already covered exposition on lexicology.

Having all the above stated in mind, we cannot talk about a uniform three-part structure of closing episodes which would be composed of an introduction, middle and conclusion.

5.1.4.1 Boundary markers of closing episodes

The focus of this section is on the boundary markers initiating closing episodes. Their raw occurrences and a percentage frequency are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Boundary markers of closing episodes.

Boundary markers	Frequency	
	N. of occurrences	%
dakle 'so/therefore'	5	33.4
eto[14] 'so/well'	2	13.4
eto dobro 'so well'	1	6.6
dobro 'well'	1	6.6
dobro dakle 'well so/therefore'	1	6.6
i evo 'and so'	1	6.6
prema tome 'therefore'	1	6.6

---

14 It is not possible to provide an exact translation of the boundary markers *evo*, *eto* and *e* in English. Their closest translation equivalents are given in Table 7.

Table 7: (continued)

ok 'ok'	1	6.6
e 'and'	1	6.6
zp 'filled pause'	1	6.6
In total	15	100

The significance of boundary markers is confirmed by the finding that 16 of 19 closing episodes, *i.e.* 84.2 %, are initiated by boundary markers such as *dakle*, *eto*, *eto dobro*, *dobro*, *dobro dakle*, *i evo*, *prema tome*, *ok, e* and a filled pause (*zp*). The list is restricted, implying that lecturers have a limited number of units marking a transition to closing episodes. Moreover, all the boundary markers from Table 7 are typical of everyday conversation, except one – *prema tome* 'therefore', which is common in written discourse (Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 653).

Table 7 shows that the most common boundary marker initiating closing episodes is *dakle* 'so'. It is a member of the modal particles II group, and its meaning can be specified as *prema tome* 'therefore' (Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 412). However, until now its function of indicating structural transition has not been identified:

(26)   **Dakle**, *i to bi bile glagolske glagolske odredbe*. (ML₁)
       So, that's so much about the verb verb complements.

Apart from being used on its own, the marker *dakle* is also found in combination with other boundary markers, forming complex boundary markers, to use the term employed by Swales and Malczewski (2001: 157). The same function is performed – it signals the closure of the exposition in question:

(27)   **Dobro, dakle** *(zp) to bi bilo kratko o leksičkoj <semantici>*. (ML₄)
       Well, so (zp) that would be all, in short, regarding lexical <semantics>.

Eto 'so/well' is the second common boundary marker. Although it can serve different functions in conversation (Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 429–30), in the explored corpus the typical one refers to marking the closure of the exposition:

(28)   **Eto,** *toliko je bilo o <kongruenciji>*. (ML₁)
       So/well, that was all about <subject-verb agreement>.

A combination of this marker and the boundary marker *dobro* also occurs:

(29) ***Eto dobro.*** *Dakle, nemamo više <vremena>. (zp) To su, to su neke (zp)*
     dakle, osnovne <naznake> kad su ovi <u>tipični</u> sociolingivstički pojmovi u
     pitanju, jezička politika, jezičko planiranje i standardizacija. (ML$_5$)
     So well. So, we do not have more <time>. (zp) That is, that is some (zp)
     therefore, basic <information> when these <u>typical</u> sociolinguistic terms
     are in question, language politics, language planning and standardisa-
     tion.

Less frequent are the boundary markers *i evo*, *prema tome*, *ok*, *e* and *zp* 'a filled
pause' also pointing to the structural transition to closing episodes as well:

(30) ***I evo***, *deset, ja mislim da je deset principa ocjenjivanja, koji u stvari go-*
     vore o tome šta ocjenjivanje <u>jeste</u>, jeste <u>dio</u> planiranja u nastavi učenja,
     ne možemo ih izbjeći, uključeni u sve nastavne aktivnosti. (ML$_8$)
     And so, ten, I think ten principles of assessment, that in fact speak of
     what assessment <u>is</u>, are <u>the part</u> of planning in teaching how to learn,
     we cannot avoid them, they are included in all teaching activities.

(31) ***Prema tome***, *(zp) da ukratko (.) sažmemo ovo što smo rekli o lokativu.*
     (ML$_3$)
     Therefore, (zp) to shortly (.) summarise what we have said about loca-
     tive.

(32) ***Ok***, *sad ću vam još jednom pročitati ove riječi, pa ćete onda vi malo.*
     (ML$_6$)
     Ok, now I'll read you these words once more, then you'll take over.

(33) ***E***, *to su ta <značenja> rečenice, sintagme i riječi u <u>kontekstu</u>.* (ML$_6$)
     And, those are such <meanings> of a sentence, phrase and word in
     <u>context</u>.

(34) ***(…) zp*** *U svakom slučaju, istraživači se ne slažu (.) po pitanju razlika i*
     sličnosti između (.) <u>pisanog</u> i govorenog (.) jezika (.). (ML$_7$)
     (…) zp Anyway, researchers do not agree (.) about the questions of dif-
     ferences and similarities between (.) <u>written</u> and spoken (.) language (.).

Not only do the boundary markers *i evo* and *e* (e.g. 30 and 33) initiate closing
episodes, but they also draw interlocutors' attention to the content examined
(Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 428, 430). Lecturers find it important to accentu-
ate that there are ten principles of assessment as well as that the meanings of a
sentence, phrase and word are context-specific. In example 34 a filled pause (zp),
together with a longer silent pause (marked by (…)), signals a transition to a clos-
ing episode. Furthermore, the context can make us conclude that what follows is
the summary of differences and similarities between written and spoken lan-

guage. The example 31 is introduced by *prema tome*, a connector specific to written discourse (Mrazović & Vukadinović 1990: 653). This is proof that it can appear in spoken discourse as well, confirming the statement that lectures oscillate between two points – planned/unplanned speech (Savić 1993: 47).

6 Conclusion

Findings regarding RQ1 reveal that the mediostructure of lectures consists of *expositions* having four structural components (expectation, focal, developmental and closing), and one of them (expectation) is optional. Concerning RQ2, results make it possible to claim that all of them perform specific communicative functions and display specific structuredness. Expectation episodes serve as a contextual background to expositions whose topics are announced in focal episodes. Topics are further elaborated in developmental episodes, and their aspects are summarised in closing ones. As for internal structuredness of expectation and developmental episodes, it is manifested in the existence of introductory, central and/or concluding parts. On the other hand, focal and closing episodes do not display such a textual organisation, but they comprise structural units known as moves. These findings are contrary to Cook's claim (1975: 66) that all episodes have their introductory, central and concluding parts. They correspond with Van Dijk's definition (1981: 177) of an episode as of a coherent series of sentences of a certain type of discourse which is linguistically marked for its beginning and/or end.

As for RQ3 and RQ4, results lead to the conclusion that there are linguistic realisations of mediostructural components, which seem specific for lectures, such as modified argumentative models in expectation episodes. Contrary to McCarthy's (1991: 158), the modified *general-specific* model shows it is possible to omit the repetition of the general statement at its end and to include an additional element *reformulation of specific statement* in the model. This element appears since lecturers present information to students in a way as explicit as possible. On the other hand, as focal episodes are of metadiscursive nature pointing to prospective discourse, three semantic classes of verbs and verb phrases are employed. In developmental episodes professors use two functional question categories – *questions posed and answered by lecturers* and *questions initiating a student response*, both of which are formally realised by miscellaneous question types exercising different subfunctions. *Questions initiating a student response* serve mainly the elicitation function, which leads to another conclusion – lectures are not exclusively monologic speech events, as Cook asserts (1975: 44), they display a considerable degree of interactivity. Closing episodes, as the last obligatory

element in the lecture mediostructure, are characterised by the use of specific boundary markers marking a transition to an exposition closure. Contrary to focal, these episodes denote retrospective discourse.

These findings could be of use to both students and lecturers. As students often have great difficulty in identifying the structure of lectures, which could affect their comprehension (Mulligan & Kirkpatrick 2000), they can be taught how to recognise the mediostructural units, as the lecture's central part represents its longest part where complex concepts are outlined and discussed. On the other hand, by familiarising with the lecture's mediostructure, professors would be able to structure their lectures in the most effective way (Flowerdew 1994: 14) to enhance the lecture comprehension on the part of students.

The results of the study may be used as a starting point for extended research into the mediostructure of lectures. Researchers could focus on the analysis of the lectures' central part in other disciplines and compare their results with those presented in the paper. There is also a possibility of further analyses of other culturally different and discipline-specific corpora that might reveal salient differences and similarities with the findings demonstrated in this study.

References

Anthony, Laurence. 2011. *AntConc (Version 3.2.4.)*. *Computer Software*. Japan: Tokyo. http://www.laurenceanthony.net/. Retrieved June 2019.

Biber, Douglas. 1988. *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johannson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.

Bugarski, Ranko. 2018. *Govorite li zajednički* [Do you speak a mutual language]? Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

Cameron, Deborah. 2001. *Working with spoken discourse*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Carrell, Patricia. L. 1984. Evidence of a formal schema in second language comprehension. In *Language learning* 34 (2). 87–108.

Carrell, Patricia L. 1987. Content and formal schemata in ESL reading. In *TESOL quarterly* 21 (3). 461–481.

Carrell, Patricia L. & Joan V. Eisterhold. 1983. Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. In *TESOL quarterly* 17 (4). 553–573.

Cheng, Stephanie. W. 2012. 'That's it for today': Academic lecture closings and the impact of class size. In *English for specific purposes* 31 (4). 234–248.

Cook, Straker R. H. 1975. *A communicative approach to the analysis of extended monologue discourse and its relevance to the development of teaching materials for ESP* (Unpublished MLitt thesis). UK: University of Edinburgh.

Du Bois, John W. 1991. Transcription design principles for spoken discourse research. In *Pragmatics* 1. 71–106.

Flowerdew, John. 1994. Research of relevance to second language comprehension: An overview. In John Flowerdew (ed.), *Academic listening: Research perspectives*, 7–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flowerdew, John & Lindsay Miller. 1996. Lectures in a second language: Notes towards a cultural grammar. In *English for specific purposes* 15 (2). 121–40.

Gregory, Michael & Karen Malcolm. 1981. *Generic situation and discourse phase: An approach to the analysis of children's talk* [mimeo]. Toronto, Glendon College of York University.

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

McCarthy, Michael. 1991. *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mrazović, Pavica & Zora Vukadinović. 1990. *Gramatika srpskohrvatskog jezika za strance* [A grammar of Serbo-Croatian for non-native speakers]. Novi Sad: Dobra vest.

Mulligan, Denise & Andy Kirkpatrick. 2000. How much do they understand? Lectures, students and comprehension. In *Higher education research & development* 19 (3). 311–335.

Piper, Predrag, Ivana Antonić, Vladislava Ružić, Sreto Tanasić, Ljudmila Popović & Branko Tošović. 2005. *Sintaksa savremenog srpskog jezika* [Syntax of contemporary Serbian]. Beograd: Beogradska knjiga.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London & New York: Longman.

Savić, Svenka. 1993. *Diskurs analiza* [Discourse analysis]. Novi Sad: Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.

Schleef, Erik. 2009. A cross-cultural investigation of German and American academic style. In *Journal of pragmatics* 41 (6). 1104–1124.

Sinclair, John McHardy & Malcolm Coulthard. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

Stanojčić, Živojin & Ljubomir Popović. 1992. *Gramatika srpskoga jezika* [A grammar of Serbian]. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Swales, John M. 1981. *Aspects of article introductions*. Birmingham: The University of Aston.

Swales, John M. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, John M. & Bonnie Malczewski. 2001. Discourse management and new-episode flags in MICASE. In Rita C. Simpson-Vlach & John Swales (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics in North America: Selections from the 1999 Symposium*, 145–164. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Thompson, Susan. 1994. Frameworks and contexts: A genre-based approach to analysing lecture introductions. In *English for specific purposes* 13 (2). 171–186.

Van Dijk, Teun. A. 1981. Episodes as units of discourse analysis. In Deborah Tannen (ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*, 177–195. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Van Dijk, Teun A. & Walter Kintsch. 1978. Toward a model of text comprehension and production. In *Psychological review* 85 (5). 363–394.

Widdowson, Henry G. 1983. *Learning purpose and language use*. Oxford: OUP.

Yang, Shi-sheng. 2010. The influence of schema and cultural difference on L1 and L2 reading. In *English language teaching* 3 (4). 175–180.

Young, Lynne. 1990. *Language as behaviour, language as code: A study of academic English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Appendix

Table 8: Transcription symbols used in the process of compiling the Montenegrin corpus[15]

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

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