HEPCLIL (Higher Education Perspectives on Content and Language Integrated Learning). Vic, 2014.

A framework for the analysis of CLIL lecturers' discourse from a genre perspective

Mª Ángeles Martín del Pozo
Universidad de Valladolid

Abstract: Internationalization strategies and the European Space of Higher Education are causing a growing interest in English medium instruction (EMI). University linguistic and internationalization policies are attempting to provide lectures with the required training and education. Linguists can supply not only the knowledge of the language but the knowledge about language which may enable lecturers to increase their academic language competence autonomously. This paper presents a framework for the analysis of lecturers' discourse to trigger reflection about the linguistic needs in CLIL/EMI contexts.

The proposed framework is based on the lecture, the main academic oral genre and still the most widely used teaching option. The framework departs from the model of lecture phases (Young, 1994) and centres in the metadiscoursal phases following Dafouz and Nuñezs (2010) modifications regarding the interaction phase. Regarding the content phase, taxonomies of three academic functions (definition, explanation and hypothesis expression) are provided.

The categories of these items may serve as a checklist at the reach of any non language expert for either self analysis or peer observation in EMI lectures. Therefore, the framework could be considered a tool for reflection on the role of language in EMI and for training EMI lecturers.

1. CLIL in Higher Education

Internationalization of universities and the European Space of Higher Education (ESHE) have accelerated the growth of English medium instruction (EMI). This practice has turned

from an added value to a must for third level institutions. However 'foreign language learning in itself is NOT the reason why institutions adopt English medium teaching' (Coleman, 2006: 4). This emphasis has important implications. The main one is that language objectives are not explicit neither at corporate level nor at individual level. The divergence regarding language focus is thus summarized:

There is an area where CLIL and EMI diverge from each other; this is the attention that each of them pays to language learning. While CLIL is a dual focused process, aiming to overtly develop both language and content knowledge, EMI focuses mainly on subject learning and exploits the language of instruction as a mere neutral tool to perform that goal. (Francomacaro, 2011: 34)

However, far too little attention has been paid to what variables can contribute to compensate for the lack of explicit language learning objectives and counteract the drawbacks of naturalistic learning conditions. This paper indicates how the language spoken at the CLIL/EMI classroom may be enhanced.

1.1   Training lectures for CLIL

In the middle of these new bilingual scenarios, one main issue concerning both CLIL theorists and practitioners remains unsolved: CLIL teacher training. Abundant evidence of this need can be found in literature (Dafouz, 2008; Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2012; Ball, & Lindsay, 2012; Aguilar Pérez & Rodriguez 2012; Martín del Pozo, 2013, *et al.*). Additionally official documentation points at this need as well as other less official sources (web sites, expert Forums, Special Interest Research Groups). This issue is also considered a key factor for CLIL implementation and success. As Coyle, Hood and Marsh state "the key to future capacity building and sustainability is teacher education" (2010: 161). Debate continues about the required competences for

these teachers. There is agreement in two main dimensions of education needed to teach in and through a second language: linguistic education and methodological education (see references previously given). As regards the first dimension, one of the most significant current discussions is language competence level for CLIL/EMI practitioners.

The linguistic competence of EMI lecturers has been described in terms of the Common European Framework for Reference (CEFR). For example, Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010: 288) establish C1 as the minimum for both secondary and tertiary levels. This paper supports the stance that the discussion would be more productive if attention focused on the type of language required for successful EMI rather than concentrating on language qualifications. This position of the debate provides models of language use in CLIL/EMI (Coyle et al. 2010; Llinares, Morton & Whittaker, 2011; Gierlinger, 2013) which could function as tools for needs analysis and language education. As Dalton Puffer (2007) defended after her groundbreaking study of CLIL classrooms discourse, practitioners necessitate academic language skills for knowledge acquisition and transmission. The proposed framework aims to respond to this request to identify academic language skills.

2. Theoretical and pedagogical foundations of the framework

The theoretical foundation of the proposed framework is genre analysis. This section refers to how this approach is used for classroom and academic discourse analysis and for integration of content and language in CLIL.

2.1 Genre analysis and classroom discourse

Classroom discourse and academic discourse could be approached from different perspectives. All methods are useful and, if combined, an integral description of EMI

classroom discourse can be assured (cf. Dalton Puffer 2007: 44). However, genre analysis is perhaps the model which shows a more considerable potential for this task. This option derives from Bhatia's definition of genre analysis: "to study situated linguistic behavior in institutionalized academic or professional settings" (1993: 181). Swales seminal work *Genre analysis: English in Academic and research settings* (1990) had transferred the concept of genre from Literature to the academic world. In Swales work and in Bhatia's pioneer and pragmatic work *Analyzing genre: Language uses in professional settings* (1993), only written genres were studied. Genres are understood as *staged events* (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990), which can be achieved by a sequence of *moves* and *steps* which is known as *schematic structure*. The main motivation behind these studies was the production of teaching materials for non native speakers of English. Practice and research have proven the potential of genre analysis in the teaching of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Also for pedagogical needs, the attention is now focusing in oral academic genres. The lecture is perhaps the most widely studied among them. A systematic proposal to the structural patterns of the lecture from a genre analysis perspective is the phase model (Young, 1994). Young defines *phases* as 'Strands of discourse that recur discontinuously throughout a particular language event, and, taken together, structure the event. These strands recur and are interspersed with others resulting in an interweaving of threads as the discourse progresses' (1994: 165). The definition and the model are the result of analyzing 72 lectures from different disciplines in order to delineate a common macroestructure and the most relevant features of each one of the parts. Phases can be grouped in two categories: 1) metadiscursive, which refer to discourse: Discourse structuring, Conclusion Evaluation; 2) non-metadiscursive, related to content: Interaction Content Exemplification.

This classification on the one hand establishes a main distinction between moves in the lecture referring to discourse and moves not referring to it. On the other, it shows a

macrostructure and some significant features which could be exploited in order to teach this genre.

2.2 Genre analysis and CLIL

In CLIL genre analysis is also valued as the "much soughtafter analytical tool that captures content-and-language integration" (Dalton Puffer 2011: 193). This claim is experience and research based because

Application to genre analysis to teaching in content classes in different parts of the world have shown its effective use, since understanding the function of a text and of the stages it is made up allows teachers and students to connect subject knowledge and the use of language. The cognitive functions intrinsic to a subject become visible through a focus on genres and their stages. (Llinares & Whittaker, 2011: 146)

In Spain several groups of studies are focusing the CLIL lesson/lecture from a genre perspective. At secondary level, the genre is seen as a tool to join content and language in the disciplines. The main research at this level is carried out by Universidad Autónoma CLIL group (Llinares & Whittaker, 2011, Llinares et al. 2011). At tertiary level, the most important results come from the Universidad Complutense project *Content Learning in University Education* (CLUE). The framework presented here departs from findings of this research group and was used in a doctoral thesis to be defended by the author of the paper in middle 2014.

3. The framework for discourse analysis

The framework is built on Dafouz and Nuñez's (2010) proposal, which is itself based on Young's model described in section 2.1. Items added by the author to Dafouz and Nuñez's

(2010) classification are highlighted in table 1. The examples are taken from data used for the doctoral thesis already mentioned. Reasons for new categories are:

The categories verbal topicalizers, non verbal topicalizers and topicalizers referring to visuals emerged from observations of lecturers. This division was necessary because lecturers introduce new topics in different ways. However, not all of them are equally efficient. For example, too many non verbal topicalizers may hindrance comprehension.

The different categories of questions are taken from Morell (2004). This distinction aims to activate reflection about how questions can contribute to learning and to interaction.

	Category		Function	Examples
Discourse structuring phase	Openers		Indicate the beginning of class/section	In this lesson we will talk about
	Sequencers		Mark a position within a series	first of all, then
	Topicalizer	Verbal	Indicate the introduction of a new topic	Another possible model is
		non verbal	introduction of a new topic without verbal sign	Change slide in silence
		referring to visuals	introduction of a new topic by referring to visual support	Here we have
	Prospective markers		Refer to future topics/ sections (present class or other)	we are going to see later
	Retrospective markers		Refer to past topics or sections (present class or other)	as you have heard
Interaction phase	questions	Referential	Teacher knows the answer	What is the result of ?
		Display	Teacher does not know the answer	What do you prefer?
		Rhetorical	Teacher ask and answers	What does this mean?
		Indirect	For the students to react	Could you raise your hand if you agree?
	Commentaries		Addressing the students directly (you) Inclusive expressions (we)	as you can see Let us consider
	Apologizing		Apologizing for deficiencies	Sorry...
	Contextual comments		Refer to aspects related to context	Temperature in any point of this room.
Conclusion Phase	Closing markers		Formal closing of class/section	I finish the theoretical lecture
	Recapitulation markers		Summarize main ideas of a class/section	We have reflected that
	Prospective markers		Refer to topics of future classes	in the next lesson we will
	Retrospective markers		Refer to topics previously covered	Here I talked about

Table 1. Framework for metadiscourse elementes in the lecture phases

These categories refer to metadiscourse, that is discourse to talk about discourse and which has been proven to facilitate comprehension and recall of lectures. Regarding the

content phase, table 2 presents several categories of three academic language functions following different authors. These classifications could raise awareness about how lecturers perform the functions.

Academic function of definition (Flowerdew, 1992)	
Type	example
Formal Hyperonym + differentia	The heap is the memory segment of a process which allocates dynamic variables
Semi-formal No hyperonym	The Process Scheduling is how the operating system organize the execution of different processes in the system
Non-formal Substitutiom synonym, parafrasing	the basic definition of a process is only a program in execution,
Ostensive Visual reference	This is a binomial
Academic function of explanation (Brown, 2006)	
Explanation what (descriptive)	the objectives of this talk will be to introduce the notion of a process - a program in execution, ok?, which forms the basis of all computation that makes a computer system
Explanation how (process)	A process comes before and input/output operation for example, OK ? Then until this operation will be performed the process has not continue its execution and then pass to this state, the waiting state. It is waiting until the I/O operation concludes or terminates
Explanation why (reason giving)	It is a queue because it follows a FIFO strategy, first in, first out , first out,
Academic function of hypothesis expression	
Real conditional	if we write these two situations we'll have a simple graph without loops and without edges
Possible	If so, if so, if an indifference curve were positive sloped, basket A and basket B could lay on the same indifference curve

Table 2. Framework for the content phase (academic fuctions)

It is our suggestion that these two tables could be used by non linguists for peer or self observation of their discourses when lecturing in English. Considering these items is likely to enhance their language awareness of academic register.

4. Conclusions

The research to date has tended to focus on the product on CLIL/EMI instruction (language learning gains) rather than in the process of teaching and learning. Considering the elements in this process could provide valuable insights of linguistic and didactic variables which could be targeted by teacher trainers. The proposed framework for the analysis of lecturer's discourse may contribute to a systematic observation of this process.

We suggest that the obtained results recall one of the main advantages of corpus based research: 'We can claim with some confidence that showing what does not occur, negative evidence if you wish, is one of the great benefits of a corpora approach, especially when we consider the pedagogical implications of these dispreferences' (Swales & Malczewski, 2001: 161). Pointing at 'what does not occur' will provide dimensions of EMI lecturers' language competence which require reinforcement.

5. References

Aguilar Pérez, Marta. & Rodriguez, Rosa. 2012. 'Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university'. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, 15 (2), 183-197.

Ball, Phill. & Lindsay, Diane, 2012. 'Language demands and support for English Medium Instruction in tertiary education'. *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*. Eds. Doiz, Aiztane, Lasagabaster, David & Sierra, J. Manuel. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 44-64.

Bhatia, Vijai, 1993. Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings (1st ed.). London: Longman.

Brown, George, 2006. 'Explaining'. *The Handbook of Communication Skills.* Ed. Owen Hargie. London: Routledge.1 ed 1986. 204- 224.

Coleman, Jim, 2006. 'English-Medium Teaching in European Higher Education'. *Language Teaching*, 39, 1- 14.

Coyle, Do, Hood, Peter, & Marsh, David, 2010. Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dafouz, Emma, 2008. 'La Universidad y el reto bilingüe. ¿Está preparada la educación superior para el aprendizaje en una lengua extranjera?' *AULA de Innovación Educativa*, 168, 45-49.

Dafouz, Emma. & Núñez Begoña, 2010. 'Metadiscursive devices in university lectures: A constrastive analysis of L1 and L2 performance'. *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Eds. Christiane Dalton-Puffer, Tarja Nikula, & Ute Smit. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 213-231.

Dalton-Puffer, Christiane, 2007. Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Dalton-Puffer, Christiane, 2011. 'Content and language integrated learning: from practice to principles'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31, 182-204.

Doiz, Aiztane, Lasagabaster, David & Sierra, J. Manuel. Eds., 2012. *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Flowerdew, John, 1992. 'Definitions in science lectures'. *Applied Linguistics*, 13, 202-219.

Francomacaro, M. Rosario, 2011. English as a Medium of Instruction at an Italian Engineering Faculty: an Investigation of Structural Features and Pragmatic Functions. (Doctoral Thesis) University of Naples, Italy.

Gierlinger, Erdwin, 2013. The languages for CLIL Model, Retrieved February 11, 2014 from http://clilingmesoftly.wordpress.com/clil-teachers-tl-competence/

Lasagabaster, David. & Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda Eds., 2010. *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, Results and Teacher Training*, Cambridge Scholars Library: Newcastle.

Llinares, Ana, Morton, Tom & Whittaker, Rachel. 2011. The Role of Language in CLIL. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Llinares Ana, & Whittaker, Rachel, 2011. 'Functions of language in CLIL secondary classes: a systemic functional approach'. *Aprendre en una altra llengua/Learning through another Language*. Cristina Escobar, & Luci Nussbaum. Eds. Barcelona: UAB. 141-161.

Marsh, David. & Laitinen, Jim, 2005. *Medium of instruction in European higher education: Summary of research outcomes of European Network for Language Learning Amongst Undergraduates (ENLU) Task Group 4.* Jyväskylä: UniCOM, University of Jyväskylä.

Martín del Pozo, M. Angeles, 2013. 'Formación lingüística del profesorado universitario para la docencia en inglés'. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*. REDU, 11 (3). 197-218.

Morell, Teresa, 2004. 'Interactive lecture discourse for university EFL students'. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23, 325-338.

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

Swales, John, & Malcewski, Bonnie, 2001. 'Discourse management and new episode flags in MICASE'. *Corpus Linguistics in North America: Selections from the 1999 symposium.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 145-164.

Young, Lynne, 1994. 'University lectures macro-structures and micro-features´. *Academic listening: research perspectives*, Ed. John Flowerdew, Cambridge: CUP. 159-179.