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Chapter 1

Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss the difficulties international students face as a consequence of current models within post-secondary education. Following this, I will explore the literature on L2 listening and Academic L2 listening comprehension. Finally, I will give an overview of Genre Theory and look at the potential benefits of using a Systemic Functional linguistics approach to explicitly teaching genre conventions for adult EAP students' lecture listening comprehension.

The Problem

For a great number of EFL students, successfully meeting the requirements of high-stakes gateway tests, such as TOEFL or IELTS, evokes a sense of security that they have developed the communicative competence necessary to be competitive members of academic communities where English is the language of instruction. Unfortunately, students are often surprised to learn that achieving the minimum test score required for admittance into Western post-secondary institutions does not prepare them for the role implicit expectations and cultural schema play in successful academic performance. One potential cause of this problem is the traditional sink-or-swim environment in many post-secondary classrooms. According to Hyland (2003), this environment “presupposes a knowledge of genre outcomes” that advantages L1 students who have been socialized into mainstream cultural values (p.18). For any ESL or international student faced with understanding lectures at an academic level, this inductive, “discovery-based approach” (p.18) to instruction leaves them at a tremendous disadvantage. In order to empower non-native students to achieve at a comparable level to their native English speaking counterparts, they must be given access to the cultural capital that native speakers possess.

Access to cultural capital, which facilitates an ability to predict the stages of a text, is especially important for academic listening comprehension due to the fact that oral transmission of information
remains the predominant paradigm in tertiary education (Young 1994). The importance of awareness of form for comprehension is investigated in a study by Carrell (1987):

"...rhetorical form is a significant factor, more important than content, in the comprehension of the top-level episodic structure of a text and in the comprehension of the event sequences and temporal relations among events."

(Carrell 1987, p.476)

Although Carrell’s study focuses on narrative reading comprehension, the significance of the positive correlation between awareness of textual organization and comprehension suggests that form could also play an important role in spoken mode comprehension. In terms of academic lecture comprehension, because students cannot reference a transcript of the lecture while listening, the macro-organization, or stages, of academic lectures needs to be explicitly taught as well as the specific syntactic conventions and lexical choices that realize each stage. In addition, students need to be provided with a means of identifying the discursive signals that mark transitions between stages of a lecture.

In order to best equip students to face the complex cognitive, linguistic, and cultural demands of understanding academic lectures, a genre-based approach to teaching English for academic purposes would be effective. In genre-based pedagogy, language is seen as a social semiotic system; as a result, emphasis is placed on the functionality of discursive units that are realized through lower level syntactic and lexical choices. Learning through explicit instruction of the discursive organization of academic lectures acts to scaffold students’ growing awareness of the communicative goals of a unit of discourse and their ability to identify how these goals are achieved linguistically.

Research in the area of listening comprehension in English for Academic Purposes has focused on bottom-up approaches to teaching listening, such as exact repetition to facilitate automaticity in word recognition (Vandergrift 2007), as well as top-down approaches, such as pre-listening as a means of building students’ prior knowledge; however, there is little research in the area of explicit genre instruction as a listening comprehension strategy. Furthermore, although research in genre-based
approaches has made considerable contributions to academic writing, there are few examples in the literature of applications of genre-based instruction for the purpose of improving students' listening comprehension.

For the purposes of this study, it is necessary to review the literature in three sections: L2 listening comprehension, L2 academic lecture comprehension, and genre theory.

L2 Listening Comprehension

Traditionally, studies in listening comprehension have focused on the five areas of study in linguistic theory: pragmatics, semantics, syntax, lexis, and phonology (Flowerdew, 1994). Much of the research in L2 listening comprehension has investigated cognitive dimensions of the listening process. In his state-of-the-art report, Vandergrift (2007) identifies two cognitive processes that are the focus of many studies, top-down and bottom-up processes (Lynch & Mendelsohn 2002; Rost 2002; Flowerdew & Miller 2005). He explains further that “listeners favour top-down processes when they use context and prior knowledge (topic, genre, culture and other schema knowledge stored in long-term memory) to build a conceptual framework for comprehension” (2007). In order to develop these organizers, researchers suggest the use of pictures, video clips, key vocabulary presentations, class discussions, cultural information, and question previews. Tyler (2001), found that providing the topic, allowing students to build a conceptual framework prior to the listening activity, nearly eliminated the differences between L1 and L2 listeners working memory consumption; furthermore, that L2 working memory consumption without prior access to the topic was much higher than that of L1 listeners.

Academic L2 Listening

The area of academic listening has not received a great deal of attention to date; however, there is a growing body of knowledge targeting second language lecture comprehension specifically. Studies conducted within this area investigate a wide range of factors that contribute to successful L2 lecture comprehension. One such topic is lecturing styles. For example, researchers identify the
differences in how lecturers present the content information. Studies of this kind have found that the lecturers tend to adopt either a conversational, reading, or rhetorical style and that this choice impacts L2 listening comprehension (Dudley-Evans 1981; cited in Flowerdew 1994).

Other areas of interest in L2 lecture comprehension are lexico-grammatical features, speech rate, and accent. These studies (Griffiths 1990; Conrad 1989; Bilbow 1989) are designed to reveal what causes students of English to have difficulty comprehending academic lectures, and to make recommendations aimed at improving the comprehensibility of lectures given to non-native speakers. One noteworthy study (Richards 1983) incorporates the knowledge base of listening comprehension into a taxonomy of micro-skills L2 learners need for academic listening comprehension. These are:

1. Ability to identify purpose and scope of lecture
2. Ability to identify topic of lecture and follow topic development
3. Ability to recognize role of discourse markers of signaling structure of a lecture
4. Ability to recognize key lexical items related to subject/topic
5. Ability to deduce meanings of words from context
6. Ability to recognize function of intonation to signal information structure (e.g. pitch, volume, pace, key).

(Richards 1983)

There have been four main approaches to research on second language lecture comprehension: a discourse analysis approach, a psycholinguistic approach, a learner strategies approach, and an ethnographic approach (Flowerdew & Miller, 2010).

The discourse analysis approach has aimed to provide ESL teachers with models for developing instructional materials by describing the organization and structure of lecture discourse. Most studies in this area (Coulthard & Montgomery 1981; Murphy & Candlin 1979) are continuations of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model of classroom discourse *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English used by Teachers and Pupils*; however, a few more recent studies have looked at discourse structuring devices, such as “lexical phrases” and “point-driven” organization (DeCarrico & Nattinger 1988).
The psycholinguistic approach (Griffiths 1990) addresses the issues of language processing and delivery rate in second language lecture comprehension.

In the learner strategies approach (O’Malley, Chamot, & Kupper 1989), both effective and less effective listeners are studied in order to determine the strategies essential for L2 lecture comprehension. The aim here is to help weaker listeners develop and employ the same strategies used by more effective listeners.

Finally, the ethnographic approach (Benson 1989) investigates ESL students’ actual listening activities through note-taking, interviews, and lecture recordings. In a noteworthy case study by Benson (1989), it was found that the learner did not focus his attention on the acquisition of new facts, but rather on processes relating to both the teacher as well as the lecture material. Benson identifies these processes as “the reduction of incoming linguistic data, the making of new connections within already familiar concepts, and an identification with the teacher’s viewpoint” (p. 421).

More recent studies have offered models for listening to lectures in a second language as well as Teaching Learning cycles designed to scaffold students’ development. In her 2002 study, Miller presents a new model for lectures in a second language, the LSL model. Miller’s model incorporates four themes: the multi-dimensional context of lectures in a second language; lecturer intention and student interpretation; the negative cycle of expectation; and the establishment of communities of learners and practice.
Of particular interest to the present study is that Miller centers her four themes on the notion of genre. The implications of this model, according to Miller, are to employ team-teaching, to teach the language of the discipline as well as the discipline, to encourage interaction in lectures, to make use of the community of learners, and to induct students into the community of practice (Miller 2002). Although Miller does not directly advocate the use of genre models to guide student development, she recommends that EAP students focus specifically "on the type of English they need to follow their courses, and which will eventually allow them to join their community of practice" (Miller 2002, p.160; emphasis added).

Vandergrift (2004) offers a listening instruction cycle that emphasizes the importance of metacognitive strategies in developing listening comprehension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Listening Instruction</th>
<th>Related Metacognitive Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning/predicting stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Planning and directed attention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Once students know topic and text type, they predict types of information and possible words they may hear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First verification stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Monitoring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students verify initial hypotheses, correct as required, and note additional information understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students compare what they have written with peers, modify as required, establish what needs resolution and decide on details that still need special attention.</td>
<td><strong>3. Monitoring, planning, and selective attention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second verification stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>4. Monitoring and problem solving</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students verify points of disagreement, make corrections, and write down additional details understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Class discussion in which all contribute to reconstruction of the text’s main points and most pertinent details, interspersed with reflections on how students arrived at the meaning of certain words or parts of the text.</td>
<td><strong>5. Monitoring and evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final verification stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>6. Selective attention and monitoring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students listen for information that they could not decipher earlier in the class discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>7. Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Based on discussion of strategies used to compensate for what was not understood, students write goals for next listening activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from (Vandergrift 2004)

In the “planning/predicting” stage of listening, Vandergrift directs students’ attention toward the genre of the text, though not labeled as such: “once students know topic and text type, they predict types of information and possible words they may hear” (Vandergrift 2004, p.11). In this stage, Vandergrift recognizes the power of knowing “text type” for predicting content or sequence in listening tasks, echoing the position of other scholars (Young 1994; Carrell 1987); however, as the first stage of Vandergrift’s model, the notion of “text type” is given no explanation. “Once students know topic and text type” is a significant leap that downplays the importance and complexity of how a genre is
established. In order for students to make use of Vandergrift's staged metacognitive strategies approach to teaching listening, the notion of "text type" needs to be unpacked.

Genre Theory

Genre theory offers a number of potential benefits to L2 listeners. As a communicative approach to language learning, the focus of work in this area is to identify the communicative functions of discourse in situated contexts and use this knowledge to assist language learners. This top-down approach offers learners a different perspective, one that both allows students to avoid the pitfalls of bottom-up lexico-grammatical focusing, and provides them with insight into what is expected by their instructors. Despite these benefits, there has been a great deal of debate surrounding the explicit teaching of genre features.

Critics of genre theory have asserted that explicitly teaching students to follow genre features is far too prescriptive an approach (Purcell-Gates, Duke, & Martineau, 2007). Proponents of genre theory (Halliday 1985; Christie 1999, 2002; Johns 2002; Thompson, S. 1994; Thompson, G. 2004; Martin 1999, 2007; Butt et. al. 2000; Martin & Rose 2007; Christie & Martin 1997) have responded that "genre knowledge is itself the result of socially situated language practices, reflecting community norms and expectations. These norms are not static but change to reflect changing sociocognitive needs and contexts" (Martin et al., 1987). Another critique of genre theory is that teaching conventionalized genre features reinforces existing power hierarchies and denies students the right to decide how they wish to express themselves. In response to these points, genre theorists assert that "to not teach the forms and structures of the different academic genres ... actually denies students choice in that it limits their knowledge of language forms appropriate to different given situations" (Purcell-Gates et al., 2007).

Despite the ongoing discussion regarding the value of genre theory, genres are useful in teaching L2 learners for several reasons:
1. They offer a principled way to identify and focus upon different types of English texts, providing a framework in which to learn features of grammar and discourse.
2. They offer students a sense of the generic models that are regularly revisited in an English-speaking culture, illuminating ways in which they are adapted or accommodated in long bodies of text in which several distinct genres may be found.
3. They offer the capacity for initiating students into ways of making meaning that are valued in English-speaking communities.
4. Because they permit all these things, they also form a potential basis for reflecting on and critiquing the ways in which knowledge are information are organized and constructed in the English language.

(Christie, 1999, p.762)

Genre Theory in Three Traditions

The literature on genre-based pedagogy is divided into three schools (Hyon 1996; Christie 1999), the Sydney School, English for Specific Purposes (ESP)/English for Academic Purposes (EAP), and The New Rhetoric. Hyon (1996) groups ESP/EAP and the Sydney School together as areas that have developed instructional frameworks for genre-based pedagogy. The New Rhetoric, on the other hand, provides descriptions of the functions and contexts of genres in academic and professional discourse communities, but does not offer an instructional framework. Proponents of the New Rhetoric () posit that raising consciousness about genres is “empowering, potentially freeing the reader from the assumptions, interpretations and ideologies that have been tacitly at play,” though “such consciousness is not itself a means of enabling learners to acquire such genres” (Freedman, 1994, p.205). Although each school has its own theoretical underpinnings and goals, Johns (2002) outlines eight principles shared by the three schools.

1. Texts are socially constructed
2. Texts are purposeful, and their functions are at least partially determined by the context and community long before the writer (or reader) begins to process them.
3. Some genres, like some language registers, are valued more than others within a community.
4. Textual conventions are often subject to community constraints, and the writer needs to consider working within these boundaries.
5. The grammar of expository texts, including the metadiscourse, is functional
6. What is present, and absent, in texts, such as content and augmentation, is often regulated by a community or the particular context in which the text is operating.
7. Genres are ideologically driven.
8. The language of texts, whether it be vocabulary, grammar, metadiscourse, or other feature, should never be taught separately from rhetorical considerations (Johns, 2002, p.12-13)

Systemic Functional Linguistics

In order to take advantage of its rich description of language, the Systemic Functional Linguistics (hereafter SFL) approach to genre instruction will be utilized in this study. Martins (1984) defines genre as all “staged, goal oriented, social processes.” Because these processes are not static, “genre descriptions attempt to capture the general meaning potential we select from when we use a text to achieve a social purpose in our culture” (Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, & Yallop, 2000).

Figure 2. Language as the realization of social context

Figure 3. Register, Genre, and Metafunctions

Adapted from (Martin, 1997, p.4-5)

Figure 2 represents the relationship between social context and language from an SFL perspective. Language as the realization of social context means that social context and language comprise one another in a cyclical, co-creating, co-realizing relationship. This relationship is further elaborated in Figure 3 in which we can see genre located within the social context circle. The language circle has been subdivided into register and language. Register is comprised of the three aspects of context of situation, Field, Tenor, and Mode, while Language is comprised of the three Metafunctions.
Register in SFL

Register is defined by Halliday (1985) as “variation according to use.” In other words, specific linguistic resources are used in specific contexts; these variations can be encapsulated within the three aspects of context of situation. ‘Field’ refers to what is being talked about, ‘Tenor’ to the relationship between people involved in the communication, and ‘Mode’ to the function of language in the exchange (Thompson, 1996). Changes in any of the aspects of context of situation will indicate a change in register.

Each of the three aspects of context of situation described above relates to a metafunction of language; Field to the ideational metafunction, Tenor to the Interpersonal metafunction, and Mode to the Textual metafunction. Within the Ideational metafunction, language is used to represent experience; within the Interpersonal metafunction, to encode interaction; and within the Textual metafunction, to organize our experience (Butt et al., 2000).

Register changes can be identified through an analysis of the choices a speaker makes with regard to transitivity, theme, mood, and modality (Christie & Martin 1997). Transitivity choices refer to selections that speakers make from process types that are realized in verbal groups; participant roles that are realized in nominal groups; and circumstances that are realized in prepositional phrases and adverbial groups. An example of some common process types are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor made our presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process: material Goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senser should consider This phenomenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process: cognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaver are writing a paper about China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process: behavioural Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstance: Matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By no means an exhaustive list of process types, the above examples show how different process types are identified. In addition to labeling the different process types, participants in the processes are given labels specific to each process type; by labeling both participants in relation to the process, it is possible to distinguish the range of possible participant roles for each process type. Additional information about what can co-occur with a particular process comes from Circumstances, which provide circumstantial information about the process.

Tracking the process types and their participant roles in classroom discourse is an important tool for analyzing the experiential meanings in discourse. For example, Christie and Martin (1997) identify two registers at work in classroom discourse: ‘first order’ or ‘regulative’ register that focuses on types of behaviours in the classroom, and ‘second order’ or ‘instructional’ register that focuses on the ‘content’ of the lecture. The following are examples of instructional register taken from Christie and Martin (1997):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Process: material</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Circ: Loc: Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>right okay now we</td>
<td>are going to start</td>
<td>our theme</td>
<td>next week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Process: material</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>'ve got to follow</td>
<td>the instructions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
you ‘ll be making an exact replica of a catapult
Actor Process: material Goal

The first two examples show how the regulative register is realized. The participant role Actor focuses on the students, and the material processes that follow focus on their behaviour. The last example follows this pattern with the students’ behavior as the focus of the process; however, the goal is a content specific lexical item, and therefore a realization of the instructional register. This final example highlights the interplay of the two registers that frequently occurs in classroom discourse.

Choices in mood (interpersonal metafunction) refer to the speech roles taken up by the speaker and the listener expressed through making demands or offers (Christie & Martin 1997). Due to the relative roles of students and teachers, these mood choices are a useful tool for signaling the movement between the regulative and instructional registers. Additional interpersonal resources that can be utilized to follow the interplay between classroom registers are modality and Person.

  e.g. So we’ve got to do a lot of concentrating.
Well today we’ve got another simple story...
I want you to listen to this story...
If you don’t have a pen would you collect those please?

Adapted from (Christie & Martin 1997)

In the first example, the teacher uses modality to convey the importance of the upcoming activity. In the second example, the first person plural is used to build solidarity with the students, and in the third example, the first person singular is used by the teacher to indicate what is expected of the students. The final example is the teacher’s use of the second person to direct students’ behaviour.

Finally, thematic progressions through a text can be tracked in order to follow shifts in register; this is part of the textual metafunction. Halliday refers to theme as the “point of departure for the message” of the clause (Halliday 1994). The theme is the first position within an English clause, which in terms of the textual metafunction, has two constituents: the theme and the rheme, where the rheme is “whatever is not the theme” (Christie & Martin 1997). The typical topical progression is for new
information to appear in the rheme of a clause and then to appear as the theme of the subsequent clause. Both textual and interpersonal themes are common in classroom thematic progression, primarily in the 'teacher talk' or teacher's monologic speech. Tracking the thematic progression throughout discourse is useful to reveal who controls the theme, to what ends, and the overall organization of the lesson.

**Genre in SFL**

In the SFL tradition, the ways in which different registers relate to one another through variations made in Field, Tenor, and Mode, mirrors the way different genres relate to one another through variation in ‘texture.’ Textural features are the ‘phases’ of social process that serve as constituents of a Genre (Christie & Martin 1997). For example, from the perspective of Field (register), the instructions for conducting an experiment illustrate how to actually do the experiment; it serves as a procedural recount of the experiment for the purposes of performing it. From the perspective of genre, these instructions are related to the range of procedural texts that have similar stages and phases, such as recipes, directions, instruction manuals. This sequence of stages and phases is the texture of the genre which likely will include phases such as 'description of purpose,' followed by 'sequence of commands,' and 'lists of materials' (Christie & Martin 1997).

**The Genre of Academic Lectures**

In her 1994 study “University Lectures – macro-structure and micro-structure,” Young argues for the six dominant phases that appear across disciplines in academic settings. She defines a phase as a “strand of discourse that recurs discontinuously throughout a particular language event and, taken together, structure that event” (Young 1994, p.165). According to Young, a phase is a “very delicate statement of register realization” (Young 1990). The activities involved in a specific type of discourse can be identified through approaching language in terms of metafunctional choices. Identifying these metafunctional choices, as well as the patterns of choices throughout that constitute the organization of
a text, is difficult to do when approaching discursive structure in terms of introduction, body, and conclusion. Young argues that these three common organizational units are insufficient to capture the complexity of phases that recur in academic lecture discourse across disciplines.

"a lecture involves more than an introduction, conclusion, and end; rather, there is a discontinuous recurrence of activities, such as explanations, exemplifications, summarizing, evaluating, and announcing of new directions"

(Young 1994)

With this complex constellation of potential phases in mind, the conventional pattern of beginning-middle-end appears insufficient to track the functional shifts that occur during an academic lecture; furthermore, it suggests that "there are many beginnings, many middles and many ends" (Young 1994, p.165).

In order to track the complex shifting that occurs in monologic lecture discourse, Young identifies two important levels of distinction necessary for conducting a phase analysis: the macro-structure, which is aimed at revealing phase patterns and the micro-structure, which is aimed at tracking phase markers (Young 1994). With these tools, Young proposes a schema of monologic discourse at the tertiary level from her analysis of a small corpus.

Young argues for six phases that are most likely to occur in an academic lecture: Interaction, Theory/Content, Examples, Discourse Structuring, Conclusion, and Evaluation.

In the Interaction phase, the lecturer maintains contact with the audience to reduce the distance between speaker and listener, and to ensure that the content is being understood. This is accomplished by posing and answering questions. In the Theory/Content phase, the lecturer presents the theories, models, and definitions that are necessary for understanding the content of the lecture. In the Examples phase the theoretical concepts presented in the Theory/Content phase are illustrated with concrete examples. The final three phases of academic lectures are considered metadiscoursal in that these phases comment on the discourse itself. The Discourse Structuring phase involves announcement
of the direction that the lecture will take. In the Conclusion phase, elements of the content are identified and classified in order to focus on their interrelationships. Finally, the Evaluation phase involves reinforcement of the other phases through evaluation of the information presented (Young 1994). Young’s argument for the existence of these six phases and the interplay between them in tertiary level lectures is based on the analytical tools presented earlier of metafunctional choices made by the lecturer.

**Pedagogical Implications**

By identifying and explicitly teaching adult ESL/EAP students the macro-structures at work in an academic lecture, students will enter into lecture discourse with an awareness of the schema of tertiary level lecturing. This awareness will enable them to correctly identify the participant roles at a given moment in a lecture, allowing them to interact appropriately; furthermore, armed with the schema of academic lectures, students will be able to predict both content as well as stages of the lecture. This increase in awareness will afford students greater comprehension than the traditional beginning-middle-end paradigm currently does.

With the ever increasing number of non-native English speaking students studying abroad, providing these learners with the schematic structure of the academic lecture genre will enable international students to be more competitive with their native English speaking counterparts. A move towards SFL genre-based pedagogy would essentially be explicit socialization into the academic culture, of which language is one of the systems of meaning-making. The SFL approach to language and EAP counters the predominant ‘sink-or-swim’ model that is ubiquitous in post-secondary English programs and could serve as a pedagogical response to the rapid internationalization of schools in English-speaking countries.
Chapter 2

Discourse Analysis and Pilot Study

The aim of the present study was to investigate the potential affordances of genre theory as an additional approach to researching second language lecture comprehension. It is my hope to address current issues and questions in L2 listening research by drawing on the robust description of language offered by SFL. Through explicit teaching of the relationship between language choices and register choices, students in the present study will be shown how to identify genres by recognizing the specific linguistic choices of language and register used in academic lectures.

The results of this SFL discourse analysis of phases within the academic lecture genre will be used to develop a pedagogy for teaching academic listening comprehension to adult learners of English for academic purposes. Because each field has its own language conventions, a single topic area was chosen that aligns with the interests of the potential participant population in order to encourage participation in the project.

Pilot Study

The pilot study made use of two theoretical frameworks: Genre theory in the Systemic Functional Linguistics tradition (specifically, Young’s aforementioned phase analysis), and Bernard Mohan’s Knowledge Framework.

The Knowledge Framework

The Knowledge Framework is described as a framework for activities and their relation to discourse (Mohan, 1986). I have chosen Mohan’s framework as a tool teachers can use to bridge the complex linguistic relationships encapsulated within discourse semantics with the practice of teaching students to identify linguistic cues that refer to these higher levels of organization. In Mohan’s words, “First and second language learners have difficulty with the presentation of theoretical, academic
knowledge, since this knowledge is usually presented in verbal exposition, in textbooks and lectures. For the framework to be useful, therefore, it needs to help students gain access to theoretical knowledge” (Mohan, 1986, p.74).

In the present study, notions of Genre conventions and phases within a text (SFL) are positioned as the ‘macro,’ or ‘top-down’ level of linguistic structure. In other words, patterns of organization, specifically the six ubiquitous phases as identified in Young’s study (1990), are seen as the highest order of structure in the academic lecture. Teaching students that these phases exist, however, is likely not enough to enable them to accurately identify the phases as they occur and recur throughout a text of considerable length and in academic register. In order to empower students with the skills to identify phases, Mohan’s Knowledge Framework (hereafter KF), offers the ‘micro,’ or ‘bottom-up’ linguistic cues that signal the occurrence of their respective phases.

Mohan’s KF categorizes the discourse markers needed to identify phases into six Thinking Skills: Classification, Principles, and Evaluation on the generic level, and Description, Sequence, and Choice in the specific level. These Thinking Skills are further arranged into three Knowledge Structures: Declarative Knowledge, including the Thinking Skills of Classification/Description; Procedural Knowledge, including the Thinking Skills of Principles/Sequence; and Structural Knowledge, including the Thinking Skills of Evaluation/Choice. See Appendix B for more detail on the organization on the KF.

There appears to be a level of overlap here between the two approaches to discourse analysis. I have summarized this in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young’s Phasal Analysis of Academic Lectures</th>
<th>Mohan’s Knowledge Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phases: Interaction</td>
<td>(interrogatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td>Classification, Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Description, Sequencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td>Sequencing (metadiscoursal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the above table, I have grouped the Classification and Principles Thinking Skills together in correspondence with the Theory/Content phase in SFL terminology; the Description and Sequence Thinking Skills are analogous to SFL’s Examples phase; and the Evaluation and Choice Thinking skills align with the Conclusion and Evaluation phases. Two phases did not have a clear analog in KF terms: the Interaction phase and the Discourse Structuring phase. I have added ‘interrogatives’ as a means of describing Interaction, and have modified the Sequence Thinking Skill to have a metadiscoursal variant in order to discuss Discourse Structuring in KF terms.

The above relationship between Young’s (1990) phasal analysis and Mohan’s KF serves as the foundation of the instructional sessions in the present study.

Participants

The participants were chosen based on achievement of a score of 5 – 6.9 on the International English Language Testing System (hereafter IELTS). This level of competence was required in order to coordinate participant levels with level 500 students at a local post-secondary technical institute.

Students in level 500 at this post-secondary institute have a listening proficiency well within ‘Stage II’ of the Canadian Language Benchmarks (hereafter CLBs). According to the description provided at http://www.language.ca/pdfs/clb_adults.pdf, students in Stage II will be designated a Benchmark level of between 5 and 8. At Benchmark level 5, student listening comprehension is generally described as broad and gist oriented of oral discourse in “moderately demanding contexts of language use on everyday personally relevant topics” (CLB 2000 p.74). At the most developed level of Stage II, students with Benchmark level 8 “can comprehend main points, details, speaker’s purpose, attitudes, levels of formality and styles in oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language use” (CLB 2000
With an IELTS score of between 5 and 6.9, participants approached for this study fall between 6-7 of the CLBs; for additional description of listening proficiencies within Stage II, see Appendix A.

The first volunteer will be referred to as ‘Julie,’ a pseudonym chosen by her. Julie is a Taiwanese speaking Chinese female, who holds a Bachelor’s Degree from a university in Taiwan. After completion of her language studies, Julie plans to pursue a graduate degree at a Canadian post-secondary institution.

The second volunteer’s chosen pseudonym is ‘Rose.’ Rose is a Kurdish and Arabic speaking Turkish female, who holds a Bachelor’s degree from a Turkish University. Rose plans to pursue a Master’s degree in Business Administration at a Canadian post-secondary institution.

**Situations**

Pre-tests, post-tests, and instructional sessions were conducted in locations and at times convenient for the participants. Due to incompatibility between schedules, meetings had to be conducted separately rather than as a group as was originally planned. Close attention was paid to the manner of facilitation and instruction during these sessions in order to minimize any potential influence caused by differences in delivery of material.

Each session was conducted at a local public library. Private study rooms were used in order to maximize focus and privacy during both the instructional sessions as well as testing sessions. In addition, participants were provided with headphones during testing sessions, as well as access to volume controls. Other controls, such as pausing or ‘scrubbing’ backwards to replay sections was strictly prohibited and closely monitored.

Students were asked to be available for 5 hours of contact time, two 1 hour sessions for the pre/post-tests, as well as two 1.5 hour instructional sessions. These sessions were scheduled twice a week for a total of two weeks of participation in the data collection process.
Procedures

Pre-Test

During the first meeting, participants were given a brief overview of the day’s plan as well as the sessions to come. Following this, each participant was asked to watch a lecture from www.ted.com and take notes. www.ted.com is an online resource that offers video-on-demand of talks given before an audience in a conference setting. On the website, TED is described as “a nonprofit devoted to Ideas Worth Spreading.” Each speaker is required to deliver his or her message in a maximum of 18 minutes in an innovative and engaging way. This website was chosen as a resource for the pre-test and post-test of the present study due to the contemporary nature of the topics discussed, the academic format of the delivery (lecture), as well as the length of the talks. Before watching the lecture, participants were informed that they would need to use their notes to answer comprehension questions in the subsequent pre-test. With a length of 14 minutes 48 seconds, participants had approximately 45 minutes to answer comprehension questions on the pre-test.

As topic material for the pre-test, I chose the TED lecture “The Future of Business is the ‘Mesh’” by Lisa Gansky (2011). In this lecture, Gansky discusses the concept of ‘share platforms’ and how they are revolutionizing business. Gansky also provides numerous examples of businesses that employ ‘meshy’ strategies in their business plan. One key example Gansky discusses is Zipcar, a car-sharing initiative that offers a cars-on-demand service.

Questions on the pre-test were derived from an analysis of the transcript of Gansky’s lecture, which was done using Atlas ti. The coding used in the analysis used the six phases identified by Young (1990), as well as the six Thinking Skills developed by Mohan (1986). Questions were designed to target information from the phases that occur in the lecture. For example, a Theory/Content question is “What is the opportunity and the challenge with mesh businesses?” An example of an Interaction question is
"Gansky asks her audience 3 direct questions and waits for a response. What were they?" For the complete list of questions in the pre-test see Appendix C.

**Instructional Session 1**

In the second meeting with each participant, I held an instructional session with the goal of defining what phases are and which ones are common in academic lectures. In the first ten minutes of the session, together with each participant, we brainstormed based on the prompt: "what comes to mind when you think about the organization of an essay? How about a lecture? Are they the same or different? What makes them the same or different?" During this discussion, graphic organizers representing the traditional ‘introduction-body-conclusion’ format of academic essays was used. In the 80 minutes following this discussion, I presented each participant with an introduction to the concept of phases, introduced Mohan’s KF, and discussed the relationship between the two frameworks. All handouts used in Instructional Session 1 can be seen in Appendix E.

**Instructional Session 2**

In Instructional Session 2, I reviewed the foundations presented in Instructional Session 1. Following this, using the transcript of the Gansky lecture from the pre-test, participants were shown how to conduct a transitivity analysis of Processes, Participant roles, and Circumstances. Because the notion of transitivity is complex and would likely leave students more confused than enlightened, the theoretical underpinnings of the analysis were not discussed. Instead, participants were encouraged to determine the type of process used in an utterance and consider “who is doing what to whom” as a means of exploring the participant roles. Table 2 below summarizes the relationship between the transitivity analysis and the frameworks discussed above.
For example, if an utterance contained two nominal groups linked by a Relational/Existential process such as ‘to be,’ then the Thinking Skill being used must be Classification or Principles. Once these Thinking Skills have been identified, participants can confidently determine that the lecture is in the Theory/Content phase. To demonstrate how another phase could be identified, if the participant could recognize that the process of a statement such as “I think ...” is a Mental process, or that the process of a statement such as “it is important” is Relational, then the Thinking Skills Evaluation or Choice could be identified, and the phase, therefore, as Evaluation.

Once each participant had a grasp of the processes involved, i.e. to use transitivity information (SFL) in conjunction with discourse markers (KF) to identify the Thinking Skill and thereby identify the phase, a discourse analysis aimed at phase identification was undertaken. This process began with careful scaffolding through the introduction of the lecture. Although this was admittedly a great deal of information to absorb in a short time, each participant conducted a surprisingly accurate analysis of the
phases with less and less assistance as the session progressed. See Appendix F for a complete Phasal analysis of the Gansky transcript using the approach outlined above.

Post-Test

Much like the pre-test, the post-test involved watching a lecture and taking notes. Participants were informed that their notes would again be the only resource they could use in during the comprehension test. The procedure followed in the pre-test was closely followed again in the post-test; participants watched the lecture with headphones, had control of the volume levels, but were not allowed to scrub forwards or backwards.

In order to control for changes in topic, and to some extent vocabulary, I chose another TED lecture that discusses themes presented in the Gansky lecture. Entitled “Yochai Benkler on the new open-source economics” (2005), Benkler discusses collaborative projects, such as Wikipedia and Linux, and how they represent the “next stage in human organization.”

Both the pre-test and post-test lectures are expected to present significant comprehension difficulties for participants; however, because the goal of EAP programs is to ready international students for challenging aural educational environments, authenticity was deemed a more important factor in lecture selection than clarity or speed of speech.
Chapter 3

Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss the results collected from the pre-test, instructional sessions, and post-test. Data will be analyzed in terms of total comprehension, individual phase awareness, as well as the relationship between individual phase awareness and topical knowledge.

Data Analysis

In this section, I take a quantitative approach, comparing pre-test and post-test scores in general and for each phase. Afterwards, I use a rubric designed for assessing topical knowledge, which was adapted from a template developed by Bachman and Palmer (1996).

Pre-Test Results

Tables 4 and 5 summarize the pre-test scores for Julie and Rose. Judging from the overall scores, Julie with 36% and Rose with 22%, the pre-test clearly presented challenges to both participants.

Participant 1 (Julie)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5/3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6,7,8</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>10,11,12,13,14</td>
<td>2.5/10</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5/2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>19,20</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>15,16,17,18</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16.5/46</strong></td>
<td><strong>36%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Julie’s scores reveal a weakness in the Interaction phase as well as some difficulty following the lecture through the Examples, Discourse Structuring, and Conclusion phases. Julie’s strength was her ability to follow the Theory/Content phase of the lecture. Although still not reaching 50% of comprehension for Theory/Content, Julie appears to have significantly less difficulty following the
lecture through this phase. Similarly, with a total of 50% comprehension, Julie exhibits adequate listening skills within the Evaluation phase.

With only a 22% overall comprehension score on the pre-test, Rose appears to struggle across most phases and with more severity.

**Participant 2 (Rose)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6,7,8</td>
<td>5.5/17</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>10,11,12,13,14</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>19,20</td>
<td>0.5/4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>15,16,17,18</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/46</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

In the above table, it is clear that Rose has the most difficulty following the Evaluation phase, with a comprehension score within this phase of 0% across 4 questions. Like Julie, Rose's results for the Conclusion and Examples phases are quite low, again representing potential points of weakness in her overall listening competence. Rose's scores for the other phases are also low; however, she exhibits strength in her ability to listen in the Discourse Structuring phase, with a score of 50%.

**Post-Test Results**

Table 5 summarizes the post-test results for Julie. Although her overall listening comprehension score is identical to her pre-test score, there are a number of interesting differences in her scores when looked at by individual phase.

**Participant 1 (Julie)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td>1.5/6</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Julie’s score for Theory/Content was her strongest phase in the pre-test; however, in the post-test we see a drop from 41% (across 7 questions developed to test comprehension in this phase) to 25% (across 3 questions). In addition, Julie’s post-test score in the Evaluation phase fell from 50% in the pre-test to 10%. Although these drops in scores are significant, there are also significant differences in improvement of listening comprehension scores across other phases. Julie’s pre-test scores for the Examples, Discourse Structuring, and Conclusion phases were all 25%; however, in the post-test, these have doubled in all cases but the Examples phase, which shows a 18% increase listening comprehension.

Table 6 summarizes the post-test results from Rose. Although her overall comprehension score increase from 22% to 26%, Rose had a number of scores drop significantly.

### Participant 2 (Rose)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td>2,3,4</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14</td>
<td>6.5/20</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5/2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5/5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8.5/33</strong></td>
<td><strong>26%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the most significant differences between Rose’s Pre-test and Post-test scores can be seen in her Theory/Content phase result. Her score for this phase dropped by almost a half, to 17%.

Other phases that exhibited a drop in comprehension score were the Discourse Structuring and Conclusion phase. The Discourse Structuring phase score was halved to 25%, and the Conclusion phase...
score dropped from 13% in the pre-test to 0% in the post-test. The drop in these scores is likely a consequence of the lack of Theory/Content phase understanding exhibited by the participant. Only the Evaluation and Examples phases show an increase in scores. Rose’s Examples phase score rose from 20% in the pre-test to 33% in the post-test. In addition, Rose’s Evaluation phase score rose from 0% to 10%. Although Rose’s overall score in the post-test appears to be an improvement over the score in the pre-test, when the individual phase scores are compared, it appears she has more decreases in listening comprehension than increases.

To further investigate the implications of the scores presented above, I have chosen to adapt a rubric developed by Bachman and Palmer (1996).

**Topical Knowledge Rubric**

I have employed Bachman and Palmer’s rubric for assessing topical knowledge because it is designed to focus on semantic appropriateness rather than on the use of appropriate vocabulary, grammaticality, or other form-focused skill. Since I am interested in improving content understanding through a macro/micro approach, this rubric can aid in the assessment of participants content understanding. Table 7 below is the rubric in its unmodified state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Ability/Mastery</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 – Complete</td>
<td>Evidence of complete knowledge of relevant topical information</td>
<td>Evidence of unlimited range of relevant topical information</td>
<td>Evidence of complete accuracy throughout range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Extensive</td>
<td>Evidence of extensive knowledge of relevant topical information</td>
<td>Wide, few limitations</td>
<td>Good accuracy throughout range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Moderate</td>
<td>Evidence of moderate knowledge of relevant topical information</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Moderate to good accuracy of knowledge within range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Limited</td>
<td>Evidence of limited knowledge of relevant topical information</td>
<td>Small, test taker deals only with a small portion of assigned topic</td>
<td>Poor, moderate, or good accuracy within range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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0 – Zero  | No evidence of knowledge of relevant topical information  | Zero, test taker demonstrates no knowledge of assigned topic  | Not relevant  

| Table 7 (Adapted from Bachman & Palmer (1996)) |

Using Bachman and Palmer’s rubric as a model, I have incorporated their scoring system and descriptions into a rubric that identifies percentiles that correspond to score, as well as the 6 target phases.

In the rubric adapted for the purposes of the present study, the percentage of the scores for each phase was calculated. I then used these percentages to determine a total topical knowledge score out of a total of 24 in the case of the pre-test, and 20 in the case of the post-test.

**Participant 1 (Julie)**

**Pre-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>4 – Complete 75-100%</th>
<th>3 – Extensive 50-75%</th>
<th>2 – Moderate 25-50%</th>
<th>1 – Limited ~25%</th>
<th>0 – Zero 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 8/24 = 33%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8**

Julie’s pre-test scores fell mainly in the ‘1-Limited’ category; however, she did have two percentages that fell within the ‘2-Moderate’ category for topical knowledge; namely the scores for the Theory/Content phase and the Evaluation phase. Julie’s topical knowledge score works out to a total of 8 points out of a possible 24. This equals a topical knowledge percentage of 33%. When compared against her overall listening comprehension score, Julie’s topical knowledge score is 3 percentage points
lower. These scores suggest that, in Julie’s case, her phasal awareness is directly correlated with her topical knowledge.

In contrast to the pre-test topical knowledge assessment, Julie’s scores for each phase fell mainly in the ‘2-Moderate’ category. The two scores that saw the most dramatic decline, those corresponding to the Theory/Content phase and the Evaluation phase, fell within the ‘1-Limited’ category of the topical knowledge assessment.

Post-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>4 – Complete 75-100%</th>
<th>3 – Extensive 50-75%</th>
<th>2 – Moderate 25-50%</th>
<th>1 – Limited ~25%</th>
<th>0 – Zero 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 8/20 = 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This equals a total topical knowledge score of 8 points out of a total of 20, a percentage of 40. When compared with her pre-test topical knowledge score, Julie’s post-test score represents an increase of 7 percentage points in her overall topical knowledge assessment. In Julie’s case, although she saw significant reductions in overall listening comprehension scores within two of the phases, namely Theory/Content and Evaluation, her other scores improved enough to significantly improve her topical knowledge score.

In the case of Rose, her pre-test scores were evenly divided between the ‘1-Limited’ category and the ‘2-Moderate’ category. This works out to a pre-test topical knowledge score of 9 points out of a
total 24. As a result, Rose’s topical knowledge percentage is 36. This is significantly higher, 14 percentage points, than the 22% she earned for her overall listening comprehension on the pre-test.

Participant 2 (Rose)

Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>4 – Complete 75-100%</th>
<th>3 – Extensive 50-75%</th>
<th>2 – Moderate 25-50%</th>
<th>1 – Limited ~25%</th>
<th>0 – Zero 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 9/24 = 36%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Rose’s percentages for individual phases in the post-test were considerably lower than those in the pre-tests. This is reflected in the topical knowledge score she earned for her post-test result, 5 points out of a total of 20. Her total percentage for the topical knowledge is 25%. When compared with her overall listening comprehension score for the post-test, they differ by only a single percentage point.

These results suggest that Rose’s phasal awareness is directly correlated with her topical knowledge.

Post-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>4 – Complete 75-100%</th>
<th>3 – Extensive 50-75%</th>
<th>2 – Moderate 25-50%</th>
<th>1 – Limited ~25%</th>
<th>0 – Zero 0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 5/20 = 25%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of this pilot study suggest two things; first, that raising a student’s awareness of the phases that recur throughout academic lectures by explicitly teaching them improves their overall listening comprehension, and second that a student’s awareness of these phases is positively correlated with topical knowledge. However, a number of circumstances may have had an impact on the scores discussed above. These factors will be discussed further in a later section.

Feedback & Questionnaire

In this section, I would like to take a qualitative look at the feedback students provided on the post-study questionnaire and verbally during the instructional sessions.

Both Julie and Rose agreed that they would use the concepts studied in this project in the future. In addition, they both said that they would recommend the macro/micro approach used in this study to others. Question 3 of the questionnaire was “was the concept of Phases useful in following the organization of the lectures you watched? If so, how? If not, why not?” Julie answered:

“Yes, the lecturer presents some examples to illustrate ideas. In addition, he evaluates his opinion in the end of the lecture...”

Rose’s answer to question 3 was:

“Yes, they are useful, but I think a person needs practice them to organize what he watches.”

Question 4 read “was the Knowledge Framework an effective way to follow changes in Phases throughout the lecture? If so, how was it effective? If not, why wasn’t it effective? Julie’s wrote:

“Yes I can easily recognize which part is example, which part is theory by listening to the signal words.”

Rose’s answer to this question was:
“Yes, it was effective, because you can determine which part is important to write and take note about it.”

Both Julie and Rose appeared engaged and open to the methods employed in this pilot study. Julie did not include any negative comments in her feedback; however, she did exclaim “difficult” at several stages of the Instructional Sessions. Rose, on the other hand, was always eager to learn new methods, but made it clear she believed it would take a lot of practice to master the discourse analysis practice in Instructional Session 2.
Difficulties & Limitations

As mentioned above, the methods used in this study are supported by the data; however there are a number of limitations that must be considered.

First of all, the procedure involving note-taking as a means of gathering information for the pre and post-tests was not structured. Since the participants involved have studied the Cornell note-taking strategy in their EAP courses, each was given note-taking sheets that were organized following the Cornell system; however, no explicit instruction was given as to how they were expected to collect notes. Each participant was only told that their notes were the only tool they could use to complete the pre and post-tests. It is possible that the scores recorded in this pilot study would have been different had each participant been given the questions before hand and instructed to complete the test while listening to the lecture. Testing was not done this way in order to simulate an authentic learning environment in which information is transmitted verbally, and the onus is on each student to listen for and record salient points.

Another factor that may have influenced the outcome of this pilot study is the design of the test itself. Because each test was designed based on the content of each lecture, controlling for difficulty of concepts was difficult. Rather than choose two equally difficult lectures, I chose to control for the topic as a means of limiting problems arising from gaps in vocabulary or background knowledge in one topic but not the other. The result of this decision was that one phase, Interaction, was omitted from the post-test. Although Benkler does engage the audience directly at points in the lecture, the responses are not clearly audible and not reiterated by Benkler making it difficult to include questions about these interactions on the post-test.

The number of questions corresponding to each phase was also difficult to control for. Ideally, there would have been equal weighting and an equal number of questions relating to each of the six
phases in the pre-test and the post-test. Unfortunately, this was not possible and in some cases the difference was significant. For example, in the post-test, Benkler provides numerous examples of companies and organizations that represent the 'next level of human organization.' As a result, there were far more questions about examples in the post-test than there were in the pre-test. In addition, some phases had only one question in the post-test which gave them a substantially higher weighting in the overall mark than the groups of questions for the corresponding phase in the pre-test.

Finally, Benkler’s speech pattern is far less succinct than Gansky’s. Gansky speaks clearly and directly; Benkler, on the other hand, embeds numerous asides in his statements. For example, midway through his talk, Benkler says:

“So we’ve got communications and computation capacity in the hands of the entire population, and we’ve got human creativity, human wisdom, human experience – the other major experience, the other major input. Which unlike simple labor – stand here turning this lever all day long – is not something that’s the same or fungible among people.”

I would argue that this statement is a little hard to follow for native speakers of English, and certainly confusing for those struggling to learn academic content through verbal transmission in a second language learning environment.

Conclusions

Providing EAP students with the cultural capital they need, specifically the conventions of oral transmission of information, is an essential step in the process of internationalization of educational institutions. In order for international students to compete in the high stakes environment of tertiary education, they need explicit instruction of the discursive organization of academic lectures. If teachers scaffold students’ awareness of the communicative goals of phases within academic lectures by teaching them how to identify the linguistic cues that realize these phases, students will likely see an improvement in their listening comprehension, and therefore, a better ability to excel when studying abroad.
The findings of this pilot study are promising and suggest that explicit instruction of phases and
the linguistic cues that signal them can be a benefit to EAP students' academic listening comprehension.

Julie saw a considerable increase in her topical knowledge assessment, and Rose saw her overall
listening comprehension score improve. Both participants are from different L1 backgrounds and come
from different traditions of schooling, which adds a level of validity to the findings of the present study.
Although these results are promising for improving EAP students' academic listening comprehension,
because this pilot study is a double case study, the findings cannot be generalized to encompass the
entire EAP community. The model employed in this pilot study, however, served as an effective way to
scaffold the participants' learning of academic lecture genre conventions.
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## Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000: Adult Learners

### Stage II: Intermediate Proficiency (Listening)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5: Initial Intermediate Proficiency</th>
<th>Level 6: Developing Intermediate Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner can follow very broadly and with some effort the gist of oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language use (e.g., face to face formal and informal conversations, audio tapes and radio broadcasts) on everyday personally relevant topics and at a slower to normal rate of speech.</td>
<td>Learner can follow the main ideas and identify key words and important details in oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language use (face to face formal and informal conversations, audio tapes and radio broadcasts) on relevant topics and at a slower to normal rate of speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand simple exchanges: conceptualized short sets of common daily instructions and directions; direct questions about personal experience and familiar topics; routine (simple, repetitive, predictable) media announcements.</td>
<td>Can understand a range of common vocabulary and a limited number of idioms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand a range of common vocabulary and a very limited number of idioms.</td>
<td>Can follow contextualized discourse related to common experience and general knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often requests repetitions.</td>
<td>May still frequently request repetition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can follow simple short predictable phone messages, but has limited ability to understand on the phone.</td>
<td>Can follow simple short predictable phone messages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 7: Adequate Intermediate Proficiency</th>
<th>Level 8: Fluent Intermediate Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner can comprehend main points and most important details in oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language use.</td>
<td>Learner can comprehend main points, details, speaker’s purpose, attitudes, levels of formality and styles in oral discourse in moderately demanding contexts of language use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can follow most formal and informal conversations on familiar topics at a descriptive level, at a normal rate of speech, especially as a participant.</td>
<td>Can follow most formal and informal general conversations, and some technical, work-related discourse in own field at a normal rate of speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand an expanded inventory of concrete and idiomatic language.</td>
<td>Can follow discourse about abstract and complex ideas on a familiar topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand more complex indirect questions about personal experience, familiar topics and general knowledge.</td>
<td>Can comprehend an expanded range of concrete, abstract and conceptual language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can determine mood, attitudes and feelings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Sometimes requires slower speech, repetitions and rewording.

- Can understand routine work-related conversation.

- Can follow short predictable phone messages on familiar matters; has problems following unknown details on unfamiliar matters.

- Has difficulty following a faster conversation between native Speakers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can understand sufficient vocabulary, idioms and colloquial expressions to follow detailed stories of general popular interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can follow clear and coherent extended instructional texts and directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can follow clear and coherent phone messages on unfamiliar and non-routine matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Often has difficulty following rapid, colloquial/idiomatic or regionally accented speech between native speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECLARATIVE Classification</th>
<th>PROCEDURAL Principles</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Defining</td>
<td>- Cause/Effect</td>
<td>- Appreciating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grouping</td>
<td>- Guesses</td>
<td>- Criticizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rules/Strategies</td>
<td>- Evaluating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourse that groups or defines:
- kinds of
- types of
- _ is made up of _

Discourse that explains or predicts the how and why of things; the rules:
- is caused by
- results in
- is due to
- if _ then
- when _ then
- Consequently
- as a result of

Discourse that evaluates, judges, ranks:
- is better than
- is worse than
- consider
- think about
- pros/cons
- any words describing opinion or preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Comparing/Contrasting</td>
<td>- Chronological order</td>
<td>- Stating opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describing</td>
<td>- Instructions</td>
<td>- Making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Locating</td>
<td>- Changes</td>
<td>- Giving reasons for choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discourse that describes, measures, or compares:
- similar to
- different than
- almost the same as
- longer/shorter/taller, etc
- adjectives
- adverbs
- "while X is y, Z is W"
- "on the other hand"

Discourse that notes cycles, processes orders, and steps:
- first of all, second, next, finally
- in conclusion
- during, after, earlier, later, before, while, initially, in the end

Discourse that expresses choice:
- modal verbs
- in my opinion
- I think that...
- I choose...
- I prefer...
- I would rather...
Appendix C

Pre-Test

Lisa Gansky: The future of business

1. What is the topic of the talk?

2. What is the “mesh” Gansky talks about?

3. Gansky identifies several factors that have given rise to the mesh. What are they?

4. What does investment in web and mobile technologies allow us to do?

5. What 3 things does the classic mesh company bring together?
6. What is the opportunity and the challenge with mesh businesses?

7. What do “pop-up” stores create?

8. How can we create a better economic situation and a better environmental situation for each other?

9. Gansky asks her audience 3 direct questions and waits for a response. What were they?
   1.
   2.
   3.

10. Transportation, wine & food, and entertainment are all examples of what?

11. Why does the speaker use Zipcar as an example?
12. How is Whipcar different from Zipcar?

13. What are some examples of platforms as invitations?

14. Gansky gives an example of transit data being displayed at a coffee shop in Portland. What is this an example of?

15. What was clever about the way Zipcar packaged car sharing?

16. The speaker believes that Zipcar got “a lot right.” What did the people at Zipcar fundamentally understand?
17. Why does Lisa Gansky believe that it is imperative for Zipcar and other mesh companies to be like a concierge service?

18. Gansky speaks about a “fabulous opportunity” that exists across the U.S. now. What is this opportunity?

19. According to Gansky, at what stage of development is the trend towards mesh companies?

20. What do the mesh and the platform we build allow entrepreneurs to do?
Appendix D

Pre-Test KEY

Academic Lecture Comprehension

Lisa Gansky: The future of business

1. What is the topic of the talk? (Discourse Structuring)
   -The 'mesh' is the future of business.
   -It is shared ownership, or the de-personalization of ownership.

2. What is the "mesh" Gansky talks about? (Theory/Content)
   -A fundamental shift in our relationship with stuff, with the things in our lives.
   -Access to certain kinds of goods and services trumps ownership of them.
   -The pursuit of better things easily shared.

3. Gansky identifies several factors that have given rise to the mesh. What are they? (Theory/Content)
   -(1) the recession – align value w/true cost
   -(2) population growth + density into cities – more people, smaller spaces → less stuff
   -(3) climate change - reduce
   -(4) distrust of big brands
   -(5) more connected to people than ever

4. What does investment in web and mobile technologies allow us to do? (Theory/Content)
   -To engage in really new + interesting ways
   -To be connected and create all kinds of platforms and systems
5. What 3 things does the classic mesh company bring together? *(Theory/Content)*

-(1) *our ability to connect to each other*

-(2) *ability to find things in time + space*

-(3) *access to get goods + services is more convenient + less costly in many cases than owning them*

6. What is the opportunity and the challenge with mesh businesses? *(Theory/Content)*

-*to make sharing irresistible*

7. What do “pop-up” stores create? *(Theory/Content)*

-*perishability*

-*urgency*

8. How can we create a better economic situation and a better environmental situation for each other? *(Theory/Content)*

-*sharing failures as well as successes*

9. Gansky asks her audience 3 direct questions and waits for a response. What were they? *(Interaction)*

1. *experienced car sharing/bike sharing?*

2. *-%/day average person uses a car?*

3. *heard of pop-up stores/shops?*
10. Transportation, wine & food, and entertainment are all examples of what? (Examples)
   - our long tradition of sharing

11. Why does the speaker use Zipcar as an example? (Examples)
   - largest car sharing company in the world

12. How is Whipcar different from Zipcar? (Examples)
   - Whipcar: people who aren’t using their car can rent it out
   - Zipcar: own a fleet of cars

13. What are some examples of platforms as invitations? (Examples)
   - Craigslist
   - iTunes
   - iPhone developers network
   - Facebook

14. Gansky gives an example of transit data being displayed at a coffee shop in Portland. What is this an example of? (Examples)
   - cities as platforms
   - inviting participation/sharing

15. What was clever about the way Zipcar packaged car sharing? (Evaluation)
   - sexy cars, fresh, aspirational, “Zipster”
   - targeted universities
   - nice experience
-clean, reliable, worked

16. The speaker believes that Zipcar got “a lot right.” What did the people at Zipcar fundamentally understand? (Evaluation)

-info company, not a car company
-types of cars, services, accessories available

17. Why does Lisa Gansky believe that it is imperative for Zipcar and other mesh companies to be like a concierge service? (Evaluation)

-because we give them so much info, and they are entitled to really see how it is that we’re moving. They are in good shape to anticipate what we’re going to do next.

18. Gansky speaks about a “fabulous opportunity” that exists across the U.S. now. What is this opportunity? (Evaluation)

-to really focus trust and attention

19. According to Gansky, at what stage of development is the trend towards mesh companies? (Conclusion)

-very beginning

20. What do the mesh and the platform we build allow entrepreneurs to do? (Conclusion)

-define, refine, scale, test things, be in conversation with people, listen
### Instructional Session 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Objectives:</th>
<th>Students Will Be Able To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>- Define what Phases are and which ones are common in academic lectures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Language**       | - **Discourse genre:** Academic Lectures  
                      - **Organization/Coherence:** Elicitation of schemata, Teacher focused discussion, scaffolding of student-centered activity, Teacher focused discussion  
                      - **Cohesion/Discourse Markers:** Students will identify discourse markers used in specific Thinking Skills that realize their respective Phases.  
                      - **Grammar:** Relational, Material, Mental Processes  
                      - **Vocabulary:** Discourse, Phase, classification, principles, evaluation, description, sequence, choice |
| **Resources and Materials** | - **Video:** TED Talks: Lisa Gansky: The Future of business is the “mesh”  
              http://www.ted.com/talks/lisa_gansky_the_future_of_business_is_the_mesh.html |

### Lesson Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time/duration:</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Introduction:** | (1) Brainstorm: ‘What comes to mind when you think about the organization of an essay? How about a lecture? Are they the same or different? What makes them the same or different”  
(2) Graphic Organizer: Traditional three-part essay structure. |
| 5 min         | (3) Introduction to Phases |
| 20 min        | Activities/tasks: |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>- handout: “Phases In Academic Lectures”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Introduction to the Knowledge Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- handouts: - “Introducing the Knowledge Framework: Six Thinking Skills”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “The Knowledge Framework”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>(5) Relationships: Thinking Skills &amp; Phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- handout: “Relationships: Thinking Skills &amp; Phases”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>(6) Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- handout: “Transcript: The Future of Business is the ‘Mesh’”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Closure:**

(7) Reiterate affordances of using the KF and Phases for understanding organization of academic lectures.

**Field Notes & Observations:**
Phases in Academic Lectures

Introduction:

In this instructional session, we will look at two ways to help us see the organization common to academic lectures. The first approach focuses on the functional purpose of sections in the lecture; the second approach focuses on the way lecturers use language, and how we can use this information to identify the functional purposes common in academic lectures.

Warm Up/Discussion:

- What comes to mind when you think about the organization of an essay?
- How about for a lecture?
- Are they different or the same?
- What makes them different or the same?

Phases:

In her 1994 study "University Lectures – macro-structure and micro-structure," Lynne Young argues for the six dominant phases that appear across disciplines in academic settings. She defines a phase as a “strand of discourse that recurs discontinuously throughout a particular language event and, taken together, structure that event” (Young 1994, p.165).

According to Young, a phase is a “very delicate statement of register realization” (Young 1990). The activities involved in a specific type of discourse can be identified through approaching language in terms of metafunctional choices. Identifying these metafunctional choices, as well as the patterns of choices throughout that constitute the organization of a text, is difficult to do when approaching discursive structure in terms of introduction, body, and conclusion.

Young argues that these three common organizational units are insufficient to capture the complexity of phases that recur in academic lecture discourse across disciplines.

"A lecture involves more than an introduction, conclusion, and end; rather, there is a discontinuous recurrence of activities, such as explanations, exemplifications, summarizing, evaluating, and announcing of new directions"

(Young 1994)

With this complex constellation of potential phases in mind, the conventional pattern of beginning-middle-end appears insufficient to track the functional shifts that occur during an
academic lecture; furthermore, it suggests that “there are many beginnings, many middles and many ends” (Young 1994, p.165).

In order to track the complex shifting that occurs in monologic lecture discourse, Young identifies two important levels of distinction necessary for conducting a phase analysis: the macro-structure, which is aimed at revealing phase patterns; and the micro-structure, which is aimed at tracking phase markers (Young 1994). With these tools, Young proposes a schema of monologic discourse at the tertiary level from her analysis of a small corpus.

Young argues for six phases that are most likely to occur in an academic lecture:

**Interaction**

**Theory/Content**

**Examples**

**Discourse Structuring**

**Conclusion**

**Evaluation.**

In the *Interaction phase*, the lecturer maintains contact with the audience to reduce the distance between speaker and listener, and to ensure that the content is being understood. This is accomplished by posing and answering questions.

In the *Theory/Content phase*, the lecturer presents the theories, models, and definitions that are necessary for understanding the content of the lecture.

In the *Examples phase* the theoretical concepts presented in the Theory/Content phase are illustrated with concrete examples.

The *Discourse Structuring phase* involves announcement of the direction that the lecture will take.

In the *Conclusion phase*, elements of the content are identified and classified in order to focus on their interrelationships.

The *Evaluation phase* involves reinforcement of the other phases through evaluation of the information presented.
Introducing the Knowledge Framework: Six Thinking Skills

Introduction:

So, how can we know when a particular phase is occurring? To identify the phases, we need an analytical tool to help us. Our analytical tool should use linguistic cues to help us identify phases. There is a tool we can use that does this! It is called “The Knowledge Framework.”

Let’s look at an overview of the Knowledge Framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Procedural</th>
<th>Structural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Structure</th>
<th>Thinking Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative Knowledge</td>
<td>Classification/Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Knowledge</td>
<td>Principles/Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Knowledge</td>
<td>Evaluation/Choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Generic                | Classification/Principles/Evaluation |
| Specific               | Description/Sequence/Choice     |

Ok, so now that we understand how the Knowledge Framework is organized, let’s look at the details. Pay close attention to the linguistic cues that are contained in each Thinking skill. These are the clues that will help us identify the Phases of academic lectures.

~See Handout “The Knowledge Framework”
### The Knowledge Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KS</th>
<th>DECLARATIVE</th>
<th>PROCEDURAL</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TH SK</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F U N C T I O N</td>
<td>- Defining</td>
<td>- Cause/Effect</td>
<td>- Appreciating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grouping</td>
<td>- Guesses</td>
<td>- Criticizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G E N E R I C</td>
<td>- Rules/Strategies</td>
<td>- Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L A N G U A G E</th>
<th>Discourse that groups or defines:</th>
<th>Discourse that explains or predicts the how and why of things; the rules:</th>
<th>Discourse that evaluates, judges, ranks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- kinds of</td>
<td>- is caused by</td>
<td>- is better than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- types of</td>
<td>- results in</td>
<td>- is worse than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is made up of</td>
<td>- is due to</td>
<td>- consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D e s c r i p t i o n</th>
<th>S e q u e n c e</th>
<th>C h o i c e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F U N C T I O N</td>
<td>- Comparing/Contrasting</td>
<td>- Stating opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describing</td>
<td>- Instructions</td>
<td>- Making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Locating</td>
<td>- Changes</td>
<td>- Giving reasons for choices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S P E C I F I C</th>
<th>Discourse that describes, measures, or compares:</th>
<th>Discourse that notes cycles, processes orders, and steps:</th>
<th>Discourse that expresses choice:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L A N G U A G E</td>
<td>- similar to</td>
<td>- first of all, second, next, finally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- different than</td>
<td>- in conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- almost the same as</td>
<td>- during, after, earlier, later, before, while, initially, in the end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- longer/shorter/taller, etc</td>
<td>- adjectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adjectives</td>
<td>- “while X is y, Z is W”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adverbs</td>
<td>- “on the other hand”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “in my opinion”</td>
<td>- modal verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I think that...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I choose...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I prefer...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I would rather...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationships: Thinking Skills & Phases

How can we use the linguistic cues in the Knowledge Framework to identify Phases in a lecture? In the below table, Thinking Skills are listed along with the phases that use these skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases:</th>
<th>Thinking Skills:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory/Content</td>
<td>Classification, Description, Principles,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Classification, Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Structuring</td>
<td>Sequencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Evaluation, Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation, Choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps for using this powerful analytical tool:

1. Scan the transcript for examples of the linguistic cues we have looked at so far.
2. Once you have found examples, decide which Thinking Skills are being used.
3. Now look at a larger section of text, maybe even an entire paragraph. Which Thinking Skills did you identify? Do these Thinking Skills suggest one of the six Phases common in academic lectures?
4. Identify the Phase of the section of text you are looking at.

Once the Phases have been identified for an entire lecture, it is possible to see how the lecture is organized.

Let's look at the transcript of the lecture by Lisa Gansky, "The Future of Business is the Mesh."

Apply the steps given above. Are you surprised at the way the lecture is structured? How is it the same or different than what you expected?
I'm speaking to you about what I call the "mesh." It's essentially a fundamental shift in our relationship with stuff, with the things in our lives. And it's starting to look at -- not always and not for everything -- but in certain moments of time access to certain kinds of goods and service will trump ownership of them. And so it's the pursuit of better things easily shared. And we come from a long tradition of sharing. We've shared transportation. We've shared wine and food and other sorts of fabulous experiences in coffee bars in Amsterdam. We've shared other sorts of entertainment -- sports arenas, public parks, concert halls, libraries, universities. All these things are share platforms, but sharing ultimately starts and ends with what I refer to as the mother of all share platforms.

And as I think about the mesh and I think about, well what's driving it, how come it's happening now, I think there's a number of vectors that I want to give you as background. One is the recession -- that the recession has caused...
us to rethink our relationship with the things in our lives relative to the value
-- so starting to align the value with the true cost. Secondly, population
growth and density into cities. More people, smaller spaces, less stuff.
Climate change. We're trying to reduce the stress in our personal lives and in
our communities and on the planet. Also, there's been this recent distrust of
big brands, global big brands, in a bunch of different industries. And that's
created an opening. Research is showing here, in the States, and in Canada
and Western Europe that most of us are much more open to local companies,
or brands that maybe we haven't heard of. Whereas before, we went with the
big brands that we were sure we trusted. And last is that we're more
connected now to more people on the planet than ever before -- except for if
you're sitting next to someone.

(Laughter)

The other thing that's worth considering is that we've made a huge
investment over decades and decades, and tens of billions of dollars have
gone into this investment that now is our inheritance. It's a physical
infrastructure that allows us to get from point A to point B and move things
that way. It's also, Web and mobile allow us to be connected and create all
kinds of platforms and systems. And the investment of those technologies
and that infrastructure is really our inheritance. It allows us to engage in really
new and interesting ways.

And so for me, a mesh company, the classic mesh company, brings together
these three things: our ability to connect to each other -- most of us are
walking around with these mobile devices that are GPS-enabled and Web-
enabled -- allows us to find each other and find things in time and space. And
third is that physical things are readable on a map -- so restaurants, a variety
of venues, but also with GPS and other technology like RFID and it continues
to expand beyond that, we can also track things that are moving, like a car, a
taxicab, a transit system, a box that's moving through time and space. And so
that sets up for making access to get goods and services more convenient and
less costly in many cases than owning them.

For example, I want to use Zipcar. How many people here have experienced
car sharing or bike sharing? Wow, that's great. Okay, thank you. Basically
Zipcar is the largest car sharing company in the world. They did not invent car
sharing. Car sharing was actually invented in Europe. One of the founders
got to Switzerland, saw it implemented someplace, said, "Wow, that looks
really cool. I think we can do that in Cambridge," brought it to Cambridge and
they started -- two women -- Robin Chase being the other person who started
it. Zipcar got some really important things right. First, they really understood
that a brand is a voice and a product is a souvenir. And so they were very
clever about the way that they packaged car sharing. They made it sexy. They
made it fresh. They made it aspirational. If you were a member of the club,
when you're a member of a club, you're a Zipster. The cars they picked didn't
look like ex-cop cars that were hollowed out or something. They picked these
sexy cars. They targeted to universities. They made sure that the demographic
for who they were targeting and the car was all matching. It was a very nice
experience. And the cars were clean and reliable, and it all worked.

And so from a branding perspective, they got a lot right. But they understood
fundamentally that they are not a car company. They understand that they are
an information company. Because when we buy a car we go to the dealer
once, we have an interaction, and we're chow -- usually as quickly as possible.
But when you're sharing a car and you have a car share service, you might use
an E.V. to commute, you get a truck because you're doing a home project.
When you pick your aunt up at the airport you get a sedan. And you're going
to the mountains to ski, you get different accessories put on the car for doing
that sort of thing. Meanwhile, these guys are sitting back, collecting all sorts of data about our behavior and how we interact with the service. And so it's not only an option for them, but I believe it's imperative for Zipcar and other mesh companies to actually just wow us, to be like a concierge service.

Because we give them so much information, and they are entitled to really see how it is that we're moving, they're in really good shape to anticipate what we're going to want next.

And so what percent of the day do you think the average person uses a car? What percentage of the time? Any guesses? Those are really very good. I was imagining it was like 20 percent when I first started. the number across the U.S. and Western Europe is eight percent. And so basically even if you think it's 10 percent, 90 percent of the time, something that costs us a lot of money -- personally, and also we organize our cities around it and all sorts of things -- 90 percent of the time it's sitting around. So for this reason, I think one of the other themes with the mesh is essentially that, if we squeeze hard on things that we've thrown away, there's a lot of value in those things. What set up with Zipcar -- Zipcar started in 2000.

In the last year, 2010, two car companies started, one that's in the U.K. called WhipCar, and the other one, RelayRides, in the U.S. They're both peer-to-peer car sharing services, because the two things that really work for car sharing is, one, the car has to be available, and two, it's within one or two blocks of where you stand. Well the car that's one or two blocks from your home or your office is probably your neighbor's car, and it's probably also available. So people have created this business. Zipcar started a decade earlier in 2000. It took them six years to get 1,000 cars in service. WhipCar, which started April of last year, it took them six months to get 1,000 cars in the service. So really interesting. People are making anywhere between 200 and 700 dollars a month letting their neighbors use their car when they're not using it. So it's
like vacation rentals for cars. Since I'm here -- and I hope some people in the audience are in the car business -- (Laughter) -- I'm thinking that, coming from the technology side of things -- we saw cable-ready TVs and WiFi-ready notebooks -- it would be really great if, any minute now, you guys could start rolling share-ready cars off. Because it just creates more flexibility. It allows us as owners to have other options. And I think we're going there anyway.

The opportunity and the challenge with mesh businesses -- and those are businesses like Zipcar or Netflix that are full mesh businesses, or other ones where you have a lot of the car companies, car manufacturers, who are beginning to offer their own car share services as well as a second flanker brand, or as really a test, I think -- it to make sharing irresistible. We have experiences in our lives certainly when sharing has been irresistible. It's just, how do we make that recurrent and scale it? We know also, because we're connected in social networks, that it's easy to create delight in one little place. It's contagious because we're all connected to each other. So if I have a terrific experience and I Tweet it, or I tell five people standing next to me, news travels. The opposite, as we know, is also true, often more true.

So here we have LudoTruck, which is in L.A., doing the things that gourmet food trucks do, and they've gathered quite a following. In general, and maybe, again, it's because I'm a tech entrepreneur, I look at things as platforms. Platforms are invitations. So creating Craigslist or iTunes and the iPhone developer network, there are all these networks -- Facebook as well. These platforms invite all sorts of developers and all sorts of people to come with their ideas and their opportunity to create and target an application for a particular audience. And honestly, it's full of surprises. Because I don't think any of us in this room could have predicted the sorts of applications that have happened at Facebook, around Facebook, for example, two years ago, when Mark announced that they were going to go with a platform.
So in this way, I think that cities are platforms, and certainly Detroit is a platform. The invitation of bringing makers and artists and entrepreneurs, it really helps stimulate this fiery creativity and helps a city to thrive. It's inviting participation. And cities have, historically, invited all sorts of participation. Now we're saying that there's other options as well. So for example, city departments can open up transit data. Google has made available transit data API. And so there's about seven or eight cities already in the U.S. that have provided the transit data, and different developers are building applications. So I was having a coffee in Portland, and half of a latte in and the little board in the cafe all of a sudden starts showing me that the next bus is coming in three minutes and the train is coming in 16 minutes. And so it's reliable, real data that's right in my face, where I am, so I can finish the latte.

There's this fabulous opportunity we have across the U.S. now: about 21 percent of vacant commercial and industrial space. That space is not vital. The areas around it lack vitality and vibrancy and engagement. There's this thing -- how many people here have heard of pop-up stores or pop-up shops? Oh, great. So I'm a big fan of this. And this is a very meshy thing. Essentially, there are all sorts of restaurants in Oakland, near where I live. There's a pop-up general store every three weeks, and they do a fantastic job of making a very social event happening for foodies. Super fun, and it happens in a very transitional neighborhood. Subsequent to that, after it's been going for about a year now, they actually started to lease and create and extend. An area that was edgy-artsy is now starting to become much cooler and engage a lot more people. So this is an example. The Crafty Fox is this woman who's into crafts, and she does these pop-up crafts fairs around London. But these sorts of things are happening in many different environments. From my perspective, one of the things pop-up stores do is create perishability and urgency. It creates two of the favorite words of any business person: sold out. And the
opportunity to really focus trust and attention is a wonderful thing.

So a lot of what we see in the mesh, and a lot of what we have in the platform that we built allows us to define, refine and scale. It allows us to test things as an entrepreneur, to go to market, to be in conversation with people, listen, refine something and go back. It's very cost effective, and it's very messy. The infrastructure enables that.

In closing, and as we're moving towards the end, I just also want to encourage -- and I'm willing to share my failures as well, though not from the stage. (Laughter) I would just like to say that one of the big things, when we look at waste and when we look at ways that we can really be generous and contribute to each other, but also move to create a better economic situation and a better environmental situation, is by sharing failures. And one quick example is Velib, in 2007, came forward in Paris with a very bold proposition, a very big bike sharing service. They made a lot of mistakes. They had some number of big successes. But they were very transparent, or they had to be, in the way that they exposed what worked and didn't work. And so B.C. in Barcelona and B-cycle and Boris Bikes in London -- no one has had to repeat the version 1.0 screw-ups and expensive learning exercises that happened in Paris. So the opportunity when we're connected is also to share failures and successes.

We're at the very beginning of something that, what we're seeing and the way that mesh companies are coming forward, is inviting, it's engaging, but it's very early. I have a website, it's a directory, and it started with about 1,200 companies, and in the last two and a half months it's up to about 3,300 companies. And it grows on a very regular daily basis. But it's very much at the beginning.

So I just want to welcome all of you onto the ride. And thank you very much.

(Appause)